The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1920 No. 2854

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 317

EDITORIALS:

The New Economic Policy of the Allies 320
The Railways on Trial 321
The Treaty in the Campaign 322
The Outlook for a Labor Party 322
Personals 323

MARTENS AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY. By Lincoln Colcord 324

THE TURK LOOKS EASTWARD. By Leland Rex Robinson 327

ENGLAND PREPARES FOR MORE WAR. By Herbert W. Horwill 330

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 331

CORRESPONDENCE 332

EN ROUTE—THE NEW ENGLAND EXPRESS. By Marie Emilie Gilchrist 334

LITERATURE:

A Great State History. By Allan Nevins 334
Militarism Rampant. By B. U. Burke 335
How the War Was Won. By Laurence M. Larson 336
A Perplexed Conservative. By Homer E. Woodbridge 336
A Brazilian Novel 337
A French View of Poe. By Killis Campbell 337

NOTES AND NEWS 340

DRAMA: Brieux and Barrymore. By Ludwig Lewisohn 340

ART: In the Philadelphia Academy. By N. N. 341

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 343

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ARTHUR WARNER, FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY, Associate Editors

CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

THE American note of March 4 on the Adriatic question shows the President standing firmly on the main ground of his previous contentions. The memorandum of December 9, for which the Allies sought to substitute another to the framing of which the United States was not a party, is declared to be "more than a mere exchange of views." In Mr. Wilson's opinion, it was "a statement of principles and a recapitulation of the chief points upon which agreement has been reached." If Italy and Jugoslavia are willing to limit the proposed buffer state to Fiume itself—the so-called *corpus separatum*—"placing the sovereignty in the League of Nations without either Italian or Jugoslav control," Mr. Wilson has no objection. In that case he is willing to leave to the two countries concerned the determination of the boundary, provided that Jugoslavia is not given territory in northern Albania as compensation for territorial concessions elsewhere. As for the secret Treaty of London, its provisions can be respected only in so far as they "are intrinsically just and are consistent with the maintenance of peace and settled order in southeastern Europe." The note ends with the expression of an "earnest hope" that the Allies "will not find it necessary to decide on a course which the American Government, in accordance with its reiterated statement, will be unable to follow." There should be no misunderstanding in Europe of the meaning of Mr. Wilson's attitude, which is entirely correct and consistent.

THE appointment of Sir Auckland Geddes as British Ambassador at Washington is extremely objectionable. The long neglect of this high office has created an unfavorable impression on both sides of the Atlantic, and has led many persons to conclude either that Great Britain did not consider the Washington post particularly important now that President Wilson has taken pretty much everything into his own hands, or else that there was for some reason an extraordinary dearth of candidates. Sir Auckland is reputed to be a man of great ability, but no one in British public life has committed more blunders or is more unpopular. He is in no degree a representative English public man, however well qualified he may have been thought to be for the principalship of McGill University, at Montreal. Somehow the Geddes brothers seem to have gained a strange hold upon Mr. Lloyd George, but the appointment of Sir Auckland is a flagrant piece of political favoritism. The appointment is looked upon as the more amazing in England because of the concern which is felt there for the future of Anglo-American friendliness.

MR. ASQUITH'S election to the House of Commons may mean much or little for the future of British Liberalism. In the House, where the Liberal leadership of Sir Donald Maclean has been felt to be lacking in vigor, the presence of the former Premier can hardly fail to inject new life into the debates and to put the Government upon its mettle. There is certainly need of an opposition that will mercilessly expose the domestic policy of the Lloyd George Government, and arouse public opinion to more active concern over the situation which Great Britain and the world are facing. Whether Mr. Asquith, who will of course replace Sir Donald Maclean as Liberal leader, can bring this about depends upon several considerations. His outspoken opposition during the Paisley campaign to nationalization, joined to his defeat of a Labor candidate in a manufacturing constituency, has not only caused him to be looked upon as a dangerous man by the Labor party, but is also certain to disturb, if not actually to alienate, the advanced Liberals who, so far as the nationalization of mines, railways, and other important industries is concerned, agree with the Labor party program. As an offset to nationalization, Mr. Asquith stands for economy and for the reëstablishment of relations with Russia; but neither of these demands, important as they are, touches as closely as does nationalization the deeper and more earnest thinking of the British masses, nor do they appear to be of themselves sufficient bases for a new Liberal platform.

REPORTS that the French Socialists repudiated the Lenin program at their Strasbourg congress appear to be based upon misunderstanding. The French Socialists are still in a period of transition and of indecision, but so far as the Strasbourg conference clarified their policy at all, it was an orientation to the Left. The party withdrew from the old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second Internationale, to which the more conservative Socialists of Western Europe still adhere, and called for a meeting with the German Independents and the Swiss Socialists who have also left the old Internationale, and with other groups such as the Austrians who are on the point of doing so, with the intention of fusing these groups on a basis of equality with the eastern Communists, who form the bulk of the Third, or Moscow, Internationale. The French Socialists refused immediate but not ultimate adhesion to Moscow, and the program which they adopted shows the influence of Lenin in every paragraph. The victory of the relatively moderate Longuet wing over the extremists led by Loriot was inevitable; the Loriot group, which secured a third of the votes at Strasbourg, had only a sixth at the Lyons Congress, last September. The outstanding fact is the almost complete disappearance of the reformist pro-war group which held the majority in the party throughout the war. It is a pity that the French Socialists are so absorbed in sterile discussions of the various Internationales that they do not try to formulate a clear policy for France.

ITALY appears to be making encouraging progress with the task of reconstruction in the 10,000 square kilometres of its northern territory which the war left devastated. According to a recent official report, over 75,000 buildings were destroyed or injured, one-fourth of them beyond repair. In 126 communes the school buildings were entirely destroyed, 130 communes lost their town halls, and 87 churches were razed; this in addition to more than 500 communes in which similar structures were more or less seriously injured. Under the direction of the Ministry for the Liberated Regions, contracts for rebuilding to the amount of 80,000,000 lire have been let, 35,000,000 lire of that amount having been given to 163 local coöperative organizations. A further government appropriation of 80,000,000 lire has now been made available. To the end of December, 28,000 houses in the Venetian provinces had been either completely repaired or made habitable by the military engineers. By the end of November the applications for reimbursement of war damages numbered, in the same provinces, 104,546, aggregating 650,000,000 lire, of which sum more than 456,000,000 lire has been expended. It is estimated that some 570,000 refugees have been returned to their homes through government or private aid. The total expenditure of Italy on reconstruction work of all kinds, including what has been done by the army, is estimated at over 1,500,000,000 lire.

THE decision of the United States Supreme Court that the United States Steel Corporation is not a trust within the meaning of the Sherman law stirs hardly a ripple in business circles, but raises considerable comment in regard to the accidental character of the conclusion reached. The decision was arrived at by four to three, Justices McReynolds and Brandeis not taking part, having committed themselves against the defendant corporation previous to their appointment to the supreme bench. Thus the judgment was not only by a minority of the whole Court, but it is reasonable to conclude that the decision would have been to a contrary effect had Justices McReynolds and Brandeis joined in it. Stated briefly, the conclusion of the Court seems to be that, although the Steel Corporation presents many of the external characteristics of a combination in restraint of trade, it was either never guilty of the practices that make trusts objectionable, or it has seen the error of its ways and has reformed. This comes pretty close to establishing legally Mr. Roosevelt's famous distinction between good and bad trusts, especially when the distinction is reinforced by the conclusion of the Court that to dissolve the Steel Corporation would be against "public interest," which is of "paramount regard." Twenty, or even ten, years ago such a decision would have been regarded as vital to American industry; but today the Sherman law is pretty well discredited, and a long series of dissolutions under it has left conditions in almost every instance substantially undisturbed. At the time of its enactment, many progressive thinkers condemned the Sherman law because of its proposal to decentralize industry in the face of a growing economic demand for greater combination. They regarded the law as fundamentally unscientific. Today they view it as merely futile.

IT would be too optimistic to assume, merely because the leaders in the House of Representatives have decided to omit universal military training from the army bill this year, that the demand for such a program is dead. It must not be forgotten that the agreement to drop conscription for the present year carried with it an understanding that the subject should be treated in special legislation, to be introduced after inquiry into the cost and economic effects. This inquiry is expected to put off consideration of legislation until another session, but the subject will probably be an issue in the coming Presidential compaign. The action of the caucus of the Democratic members of the House makes it virtually certain that their party platform will contain no plank for compulsory service, although not necessarily one against such a program. A strong effort will probably be made to incorporate a compulsory service plank in the Republican platform, but it is difficult to see how the more astute party leaders can allow such a folly to be committed. The recent resolution of the League of Women Voters, at its Chicago convention, against universal service ought to give pause to the militarists. In any event, time will run in favor of the opposition. As the war fever cools, and as workingmen realize that one of the motives behind the demand for conscription is not fear of foreign aggression but desire to have an army to use against organized labor, the chance of foisting this sinister plan on the country will dwindle.

UNSTINTED credit is due to the members of the American Legion who have called a halt on the effort of its officers to use the organization to further the campaign for bonuses. According to information at this writing, protests from various quarters, particularly the South, have led to a decision to call a conference at Washington, on March 22, to determine the policy of the organization in this regard. Certainly the more self-respecting and level-headed members of the American Legion will oppose the effort that has been going on in behalf of the organization to induce Congress to adopt an ambitious scheme of land settlement, home aid, and vocational training; or else a cash bonus, for those who prefer it, amounting to $50 a month for the term of their service. In New York, there is a proposition to demand not only $50 a month from the Federal Government, but an extra $10 a month from the State. *The Nation* believes that men disabled in the recent war should be justly provided for, but that government subvention should stop there. With the exception of the Australasians, our soldiers were far and away the highest

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paid of any serving in the European conflict. They were demobilized at a time when there was great demand for workers, and although some soldiers were undoubtedly financial losers as a result of their service, it is equally certain that others advanced themselves by it. So far as the public is concerned, Representative Madden, of Illinois, states that any of the various aid proposals, calling for from two to twenty billion dollars, would require a bond issue at 6 per cent, one result of which would be to reduce the value of Liberty bonds to seventy-five cents on the dollar.

IF any one imagined, by the docility with which the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment was originally received by the public, that prohibition could be established without a fight, he must have changed his opinion in the light of recent events. The repercussion has been slow in coming, but it is evidently here. New Jersey has just passed a law permitting the use of liquors containing up to 3.50 per cent of alcohol; a Federal judge in Wisconsin has sustained a 2.50 per cent content; the Assembly at Albany has voted to investigate the activities of the Anti-Saloon League; the town elections in Vermont and Massachusetts have just revealed an overwhelming swing from "dry" to "wet"; and, according to a correspondent of the New York *World*, the campaign of the Anti-Saloon League for a fund of $25,000,000 to enforce prohibition in America and work for it abroad, begun in some of the Southern States, has been dropped because of failure. It is quite possible that prohibition will be an important issue in the elections next fall, and it is by no means impossible that the Eighteenth Amendment may evolve eventually into a method of local option by States, each one enforcing it to such degree as its voters favor.

TWO days after he assured the students at Swarthmore College that he was not a candidate for the Presidency, the Attorney General threw his hat into the ring. It is explained that he was suddenly given the opportunity to do so by friends of the Administration who felt that there must be a candidate in the Georgia primaries who would stand for all the Wilson policies. Of course, Mr. Palmer has been for months past as active a candidate as he dared to be in view of the silence of Mr. Wilson as to his own plans. No one could follow Mr. Palmer's outgivings on the "Red Menace," which, by the way, has almost completely disappeared from the news columns of the daily press, without seeing plainly that he was in more than a receptive state of mind toward the Presidency. But his candidacy is not going to be smooth sailing. The Republicans in Congress are already beginning to play politics by suggesting impeachment proceedings for Mr. Palmer's too kindly treatment of the Louisiana sugar producers, and the matter is to be investigated by the Judiciary Committee of the House. Mr. Palmer, in turn, is abusing Congress by laying at its door his complete failure to reduce the high cost of living, so loudly proclaimed last fall as his intention. Apparently he forgets that the chief method of bringing down the cost of living was to have been that of imprisoning a lot of profiteers; and Congress has certainly not interfered with that sport. Whether the sugar inquiry will yield results, no one can know; but if the real history of Mr. Palmer's administration of his office as Alien Property Custodian is ever written, it will be unhappy reading whether he is President or not.

THE development of community sentiment and the building of community houses in rural districts belong to one of the most promising movements in American life. A bulletin concerning such houses, just issued by the Department of Agriculture, offers valuable suggestions as to financing, planning, maintaining, and using them, with many details regarding community houses already in existence. What stands out in accounts of this sort is a certain competence and independence on the part of the communities which undertake to make their lives more comfortable, more friendly, more graceful. That a real advance is being made appears from the first number of a periodical called *Community Progress*, put forth by the North Carolina College for Women, at Greensboro. This little paper has for its purpose the coördination of the existing social agencies of the State, particularly through helping teachers to make the schools true community centers and aiding and encouraging volunteer leaders generally. *Community Progress* bids fair to be helpful, as it is intelligent. Its editorial on tolerance, for instance, is wholesome and enlightened. Moreover, the editors understand the essential importance of working with the tools one has. Is this, after all, not the true American spirit?

REPRESENTATIVES of twenty-one nations attended a conference of the International Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, which was held recently in London. The work of the Association in the matter of town planning is being carried on principally in the devastated areas of France, where a law of March, 1919, has restricted private building enterprises in order to conform to municipal needs. It is also proposed to construct five or six "garden" suburbs within easy reach of Paris. In London, where the shortage of houses is estimated at 750,000, the Association has undertaken to erect during a period of five years 30,000 houses in the more crowded and unsanitary parts of the metropolis. An effort is also being made to introduce timber houses in England, the Englishman's aversion to any dwelling that is not built of brick or stone being one of the most serious difficulties with which the English branch of the Association has had to contend. Reports made to the conference by delegates testified to the rapid strides which the housing movement has made in the last few years in all parts of the world.

MR. HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, who has been managing editor of *The Nation* for the last two years, has resigned to take up even more responsible duties with *The Searchlight*, that useful publication in Washington which helps to turn the light of publicity upon the proceedings of Congress. Evidently it is the destiny of *The Nation* to give up its editors to other publications after they have served it for a period. Thus Mr. Harold de Wolf Fuller left to help found *The Review*, Mr. Albert Jay Nock to help establish *The Freeman*, and now Mr. Mussey is to take his unusual abilities and high ideals to *The Searchlight*. What is a great piece of good fortune for *The Searchlight* is a great loss to *The Nation*. We should find it hard to set forth in moderate terms how *The Nation* feels toward Mr. Mussey, what it owes to him, and how loyal and devoted he has been to its fortunes. In all its long history, no one ever served this journal more faithfully or with less thought of self. He carries with him the sincere good wishes of all the editorial staff.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Economic Policy of the Allies

THERE are gratifying signs that the Allies are beginning to realize the necessity of doing something about the economic situation in Europe. Having spent a year and more in unmaking and remaking the political map, in piling impossible burdens upon what is left of the former Central Powers, in yielding to the demands of French vengeance, and in trying to ward off, when they did not pretend to ignore, the menace of a Bolshevism which their policy was doing much to foster, they are now, apparently, awakening to the fact that people cannot work unless they eat, that they cannot eat unless they produce food or things that can be exchanged for food, and that they cannot and will not produce so long as money is almost hopelessly depreciated, trade interfered with or prohibited, foreign exchange demoralized, and an impassable mountain of debt erected between the present and the future. The statesmen who have been oscillating between Paris and London, and who will, it is reported, shortly extend their travels to Rome, appear to perceive that unless something is done to relieve the acute economic disorders from which all Europe is suffering, the world-wide collapse which even the wisest fear will surely come, and come soon.

It is toward the country with which none of the Allies is publicly at war but which a number of the Allies have been fighting, the country whose rich stores of food and materials might long since have helped to restore the economic balance in Europe if only the Allies had allowed them to come out, that the new economic policy has been in the first instance directed. On January 16 the Supreme Council announced its purpose to allow trade in certain articles to be engaged in between Allied and neutral countries and the Russian cooperative societies. It was an awkward and bungling step; for not only was the announcement accompanied by the statement that what was proposed implied "no change in the policies of the Allied Governments toward the Soviet Government," but it also presently appeared that there would be no trade with the coöperators unless the Soviet Government was recognized. Nevertheless, the first step had been taken; the Supreme Council had publicly admitted the propriety of removing trade barriers against Russia. Accordingly, when Mr. Lloyd George, on February 10, told the House of Commons that, having "failed to restore Russia to sanity by force," he believed "we can save her by trade," there was reason for thinking that the camouflage of rhetoric only thinly concealed a purpose to bring Russia once more within the circle of European economic interests, even if recognition had to be accorded in order to achieve it.

The obstacle, as usual, was France. In spite of such indications of popular feeling as the strongly worded resolutions of the Lyons municipal council in favor of raising the Russian blockade, and the formation of a company with a capital of 25,000,000 francs, backed by some of the largest financial and commercial organizations in France, to develop commercial relations with Russia, the Government adhered to its policy of "no dealings with the Soviets." On February 24, however, the Supreme Council reaffirmed, and at the same time broadened, its position by declaring that "commerce between Russia and the rest of Europe, which is so essential for the improvement of economic conditions not only in Russia but in the rest of the world, will be encouraged to the utmost degree possible without relaxation of the attitude" of non-recognition of the Soviet Government. At the same time the Council gave its approval to a proposal emanating from the International Labor Bureau of the League of Nations for the dispatch of a commission to Russia "to examine into the facts." The opposition of Premier Millerand appeared to be weakening, as well it might in view of the statement of M. Marcel Cachin, Socialist leader in the Chamber of Deputies, that Great Britain had lately sold $50,000,000 worth of goods to Russia. Even the semi-official Paris *Temps* could only urge that goods which might be used for military purposes must not be sent into Russia until the proposed commission had made its inquiry, and that Germany must not be allowed to capture Russian trade.

On March 1 the Supreme Council once more widened the hem of its garment by drawing up, in its economic section, a set of principles for the general economic rehabilitation of Europe. The necessity of joint action in developing production, improving the condition of the working classes, sacrificing individual interests to the general interest in the distribution of raw materials and in the matter of transport, reducing the cost of armaments, and bringing Russia and Germany to "a position to contribute to the economic life of the whole of Europe"—such are the main heads of the program which was to enforce the truth that "Europe is an economic unit, and in order that she may regain economic health all the different parts must regain their strength." Again the French press urged the necessity of keeping Germany and Russia in subjection, lest the "hegemony" of the one and the "malevolent influence" of the other should once more be exercised. The next day, however, Premier Nitti proposed to the Supreme Council an international loan to Germany for the purpose of furnishing that country with "raw materials necessary for the normal working of her industries"; the loan to be provided by neutral countries, and administered by a neutral commission instead of by the Reparation Commission. French influence was sufficient to prevent public announcement of the full text of the proposals and to delay action, but there is little doubt that the substance of the plan will be adhered to.

There is no mistaking the significance of these various recommendations. After long months of backing and filling, Russia and Germany are at last openly recognized as danger spots. The policy of treating Russia as an outcast among the nations, shutting it off from the rest of the world by armies and fleets, invading it with Allied and American forces in order to restore its "sanity," and cutting off its trade has broken down. Europe needs Russian food to keep it from starvation, Russian raw materials to supply its factories, the Russian markets to restore its trade. As for Germany, the policy of holding over its head an undefined obligation in the form of indemnities and reparations means a disastrous prolongation of the period of recovery. Even the Supreme Council is now reported to be of the opinion "that the German Government can organize its finances and industries more efficiently if the German people know exactly what are their obligations and what they are to be called upon to pay." If the Supreme Council has really grasped this obvious proposition and is prepared to act upon it, there is a welcome rift in the darkened sky of European reorganization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Railways on Trial

IN an address before the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, on February 17, Mr. Hoover said:

> The return of the railways to the owners places predominant private operation upon its final trial. If instant energy, courage, and large vision in the owners should prove lacking in meeting the immediate situation, we will be faced with a reaction that will drive the country to some other form of control. Energetic enlargement of equipment, better service, coöperation with employees, and the least possible advance in rates, together with freedom from political interest, will be the scales upon which the public will weigh these results.

Congress had the immediate financial needs of the railways primarily in mind when it shaped the makeshift Cummins-Esch measure. The railway executives, however, as they take back their properties, must, as Mr. Hoover suggests, keep considerations of public service in the forefront of their thinking if they are not to see the mind of the people turn quickly from private ownership and management. Since the day when the Supreme Court, in the Granger cases, asserted the semi-public character of railway property, there has been a progressive movement toward increasingly strict public control of the roads. Such regulation, however mistaken in details, has been an attempt to embody the sound principle that the public interest is paramount. The taking over of the roads as a war measure was simply a striking application of the same principle. The owners must now show that the return of the roads does not contravene it.

From this point of view the railway executives face a staggering task of financing, organization and technical operation, and labor management. They may succeed in earning dividends, but their success will be short-lived unless it be attained through public service of a high order. In every case their achievement will be compared with the results accomplished during the period of unified control now brought to a close. The work of propagandists, whether for or against government ownership and operation, will not long be successful in keeping from the public a knowledge of the facts of the railway history of the past two years. Notwithstanding the exceptional character of those two years, the record of the Railroad Administration will properly serve as a standard for judgment of the work of the roads now that they are again in private ownership.

In his report to the President, made public on February 29, Director General Hines, himself a railway executive of broad experience, declares that private operation of the lines during the war period would have involved even greater outlay than occurred under Federal control, and without the same efficiency. As Mr. Hines points out, the government, by using its own money for capital expenditures during the war, relieved the railways of the necessity of raising funds for themselves. This task they must now resume, and under extremely difficult conditions. Many years ago James J. Hill, one of America's most far-seeing business men, startled the country by declaring that the railways would need a billion dollars a year for ten years in order to meet the growing demands upon them. In the period preceding the war they got only a fraction of that amount. Financial, rather than industrial, management of many roads, operations like the looting of the New Haven and the Rock Island, and the continuance of discrimination in favor of particular localities and industrial concerns despite all attempts to prevent it, had undermined confidence in private railway management to such an extent as to bring an imperative demand for strict public regulation. In face of this condition it became harder and harder to get capital, except at high rates; and even before the war we experienced a practical breakdown of railway transportation. Mr. Hines states that the roads go back in substantially as good condition as when they were taken over by the government. This means that they must find literally billions of money for rehabilitation and improvement of right of way, terminals, rolling stock, and equipment of every sort. They must accomplish this by their individual credit in a competitive market depleted by government and private borrowings. Further, the provision of the new law designed to insure a 5½ per cent return on the total property investment of the roads grouped by districts, while designed to help the credit of the weak roads, is likely to lessen the interest of the investing public in the securities of the strong lines, which are to be milked to help their weaker sisters. It is hard to see where the roads can find a substitute for government credit, which in the present public temper will scarcely be put at command of private business. Yet somehow the railway executives must get cheap capital from private sources.

On the side of organization and operation the problem is no less difficult. We have today no real transportation system. The private interests of the roads have hitherto prevented the development of inland waterways, or of any comprehensive organization of port and terminal facilities with proper routing of traffic, to say nothing of the joint use of rolling stock, terminal facilities, and other equipment that can be more effectively utilized in that way. In this respect the past two years have taught us many lessons. In one of his reports, Mr. McAdoo asserted that the joint use of equipment under Federal control had added the equivalent of 300,000 cars and $900,000,000 in assets to the railway service; and Mr. Hines in his report indicates striking economies and heightened efficiency as a result of the unification practises of the Government. It is announced that the companies will retain the consolidated ticket offices, but the old struggle of the roads to keep their cars on their own lines has already begun. The railway managers confront a fundamental question. Can they sink their private differences in such a way as to maintain the gains of the past two years and also to enter upon the development of a real transportation system, embracing the railways, the water routes, the port and terminal facilities, the control of routing and classification—in short, all the essentials to the production of transportation and not merely of dividends?

In their relations with labor they must evince the same quality. When the railway workers failed to make the public understand the idea of service at cost upon which, essentially, the Plumb plan was based, and allowed themselves to fall back into the old selfish struggle for more of the spoils, they let slip a magnificent opportunity. Yet the seed has been planted, and it is growing. The old relation of labor to the enterprises in which it is engaged is a thing of the past. There will be no efficient railway service without a loyal and enthusiastic personnel; there will be no such personnel until executives take men into an honest democratic partnership aiming at service rather than profits. Only in some such way will labor unrest disappear.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Treaty in the Campaign

WHATEVER the outcome of President Wilson's uncompromising attitude on the peace treaty, his controversy with the Senate will have had the effect of opening the way for the injection of the whole question into the campaign, precisely as the President, as his Jackson Day letter showed, desired that it should be. Already Mr. Palmer announces that the treaty will be the predominant issue of the Presidential struggle, and we may be sure that the Republicans will vie with the Democrats in the attempt to place the blame for defeating the treaty upon their rivals.

But is it so clear that the treaty can be made the predominant issue of the campaign? It is easy to affirm in March what the compelling subject of discussion will be in September and October, but events and political developments have a bad habit of paying as little attention to the fiat of politicians as the ocean tide did to King Canute. For one thing, the country is today bored by the whole treaty discussion. It has had almost a year of debate, and the one predominant thought about it now is the wish to get rid of the whole business. This is clearly illustrated by the changed attitude of such anti-Lodge journals as the New York *Evening Post*. After having for months solemnly assured its readers that there was nothing to the Lodge opposition, that Mr. Lodge and his cohorts would be brushed aside by an outraged public opinion, the *Evening Post* is now calling upon Mr. Wilson to accept defeat and to agree to the Lodge revision. Where is the Democratic spokesman who can thrill the country for four months with the demand that it stand by Mr. Wilson and such Senators as would accept the treaty without changing a single word or phrase? Even should there be no change in the financial and economic situation, such an effort would be an almost impossible task. We are the most volatile and changeable of peoples, interested in a subject only for a brief season; already the public has tired of the bogie of a red revolution. To expect the voters to listen for half a year to harangues about the treaty and to assurances that the treaty must not be altered because Mr. Wilson says that it must not be, while at the same time the high cost of living bears heavily upon the people and there is financial stringency in the world, is to expect the impossible. If there should be worse times before mid-summer, with much unemployment and many empty dinner-pails, as others beside Sir George Paish anticipate, he will be a brave orator indeed who shall even mention the treaty.

More than that, we have no machinery for taking a popular referendum. Switzerland will vote on May 15 as to whether or not that country shall join the League of Nations. The United States could create the necessary machinery for such a referendum in a short time if it chose—there was no difficulty in setting up the machinery to register all young men for the draft on a single day. But, failing the machinery, it will be impossible to tell what any vote next fall will signify as to the treaty. Mr. Wilson will pay once more for his folly in interweaving the treaty and the covenant of the League, for many votes may be cast against the treaty which would favor the League were each voter to receive a ballot containing such questions as these: "Do you wish the United States to join the League of Nations?"; "Do you favor the ratification of the treaty with or without reservations?" How can the average voter be made to realize that, if he votes for a particular Republican candidate, he thereby favors Lodge reservations which he does not clearly understand? And what will he do if his choice lies between an irreconcilable Republican, and a Democrat who favors certain reservations but not all?

Moreover, every week sees the further breaching of the treaty. Many who were aghast at *The Nation's* denunciation of the "Madness at Versailles," last May, are now agreeing with Mr. Keynes that the treaty is economically unworkable, and that the hypocritical Four or Five who drew it up knew that it was unworkable when they signed it. Now we have the book of the veteran English journalist, Dr. Dillon, to tell us that Mr. Wilson's surrender at Paris "knelled the political world back to the unregenerate days of strategical frontiers, secret alliances, military preparations, financial burdens, and the balance of power." The Allies have abandoned their impossible demand for the German war culprits, and are talking of violating the treaty further by fixing a definite sum for reparations and offsetting the economic scourging of Germany by furnishing that country with raw materials and a loan. We venture the prediction that, six months from now, the wickedness of the treaty and its bogus economic character will be so much more clearly understood than they are even now, that anyone who then advocates it, even the self-satisfied Mr. Wilson himself, will be completely on the defensive. It may well happen that the only question then—particularly if there should by that time be a Liberal-Labor Government in England—will be how soon the whole document, with its repudiation of the ideals for which America fought, can be entirely recast.

The Outlook for a Labor Party

THE defeat at Seattle of the Labor party candidate for Mayor, James Duncan, by the candidate of the combined forces opposing labor, gives rise to some interesting speculations regarding the function and probable future of the Labor party in American politics. Mr. Duncan received 34,059 votes; his opponent, 50,840. The conservative majority was large, but the Labor party vote, secured in its first campaign, was also large, being about 35 per cent of the total.

Such figures hardly serve as a basis for estimating the chances in the coming national election of a Labor party; but they indicate very clearly the need of such a party. The people of the United States are facing a political vacuum. Both old parties, and nearly all of the candidates put forward by them, mock the hopes and aspirations of men and women of liberal interests. The Socialist party has never made more than a limited appeal to the trade unionists and farmers of the country, while the foreign affiliations of the party and its sympathy for the Soviet Government of Russia, its conflicts with the authorities and its internal wrangles, have served to injure it even with those workers who quite unhesitatingly have incorporated almost the whole Socialist platform in the Labor party program. The value in American public life of a party of revolutionary sympathies and peaceful purposes can hardly be denied, but in spite of the efforts of the statesmen at Albany to create sympathy and support for the Socialist party, its immediate usefulness as a medium for expressing the will of the trade unionists and the unaffiliated radicals of the United States is not great, and its future would seem

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be in the lap of the international revolutionary movement.

It would seem, therefore, that no force could prevent the growth of a Labor party to fill the need of the time; and supporters of the Labor party assert this to be the case. But Mr. Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, has laid plans which seem designed, if any influence can do it, to sap the strength of the new party at its birth. In a statement breathing fire and revolutionary class consciousness, Mr. Gompers has called upon the faithful to punish at the next election those who have used the "halls of Congress" to "foster and spread a vicious propaganda against the efforts of the toilers to exercise their normal and lawful activities for the protection and promotion of their interests and welfare," by supporting those candidates who have been "friendly to labor's interests" and defeating those who are "hostile or indifferent." To make it plain that this is more than a repetition of its usual campaign pronouncements, the Federation has organized a political machine throughout the country to investigate personal records, bring pressure upon candidates, conduct campaigns, and deliver the labor vote to the proper persons. Labor will swing Republican or Democratic with impartial zeal, according as the candidates of either party pass the labor examination submitted to them.

The vigor and honesty of the movement seem to be attested by the indorsement of similar tactics by the Farmer-Labor Congressional Committee, headed by George P. Hampton, of the Farmers' National Council, and Warren S. Stone, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. *Labor*, the organ of the Plumb Plan League, is supporting the plan and has called for the election of a Congress containing "at least 200" representatives of labor. Its editorial on the subject contained an amusing and doubtless unconscious hint of sympathy with Soviet methods. "In a real democracy," it declared, "the workers and farmers would control the government. . . . The workers and farmers should have 350 men in Congress if they had their share. The lawyers alone have 260 members. The bankers have many times their quota, as have the packers and the food gamblers. The steel trust, the sugar trust, the lumber trust, and the mine owners are more than adequately represented." This is industrial representation with a vengeance.

What such tactics may mean for the future of an American Labor party can hardly be known until after the election. Despite the vehement and intolerant opposition of Mr. Gompers, the Labor parties in several States have announced their intention, with the support of large bodies of organized labor, of carrying through a vigorous independent campaign. They have denounced as futile the policy of supporting candidates who, whatever may be their personal views or pretensions, are bound by the platforms and campaign contributions of the Republican or Democratic parties. Men and women who believe that they are "throwing away their votes" when they cast them for a candidate who cannot win, will doubtless follow Mr. Gompers, and the vote of the Labor party will be reduced by that much. Those who believe that the creation of a vigorous non-Socialist minority party, whether its candidates win or lose, is of more political significance than the election of an old-party candidate however amiable, will vote for the Labor party. If Mr. Gompers is successful in his campaign, the growth of the Labor party will unquestionably be slow; but even Mr. Gompers can scarcely doubt but that it will be sure.

Personals

ROMAN D'UN JEUNE HOMME PAUVRE. Cadet, old military family almost extinct, having grappled with post-bellum conditions and achieved modicum artistic and commercial success, desires resume social intercourse with such of the breed as do not consider trade ignoble. Requisites, brains and birth. Profiteers and plutocrats taboo. Dancing anathema.—Box B. 475, *The Times*.

Thus a Personal in the London *Times* of a recent issue. Why does not American life offer the rich and joyful possibilities of the *Times* Personals? We have plenty of persons. Let us suggest a few notices that might well appear in the Minor Thunderer of New York, if some movement in the direction of such candor should suddenly catch up our population and hurry it into the Personal mood. This, for instance, would suit Mr. Hoover:

THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE. American promoter living mostly abroad, type now less numerous than formerly, having grappled with interbellum conditions and achieved remarkable success, desires resume official intercourse with such of native breed as approve career. Requisite, the Presidency on a platter. Republicans and Democrats taboo. Decision which party to turn to, anathema.

Or this for Mr. Archibald Stevenson:

THE WONDERS OF THE INVISIBLE WORLD. Witch-hunter, genus happily almost extinct, having grappled with post-bellum conditions and achieved mediocre public and professional success, desires resume social intercourse with such of the breed as do not consider late trade disgusting. Requisites, purse and pride. Decency and democracy taboo. Tolerance, anathema.

The Vice-President could advertise as follows:

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN.—Public servant, position unique but not perennial, having grappled with terrible conditions and achieved modern and agreeable publicity, desires resume normal intercourse with such of breed as also stand and wait. Requisites, good humor and lack of malice. Sophistication and subtlety taboo. Senators anathema.

We might expect Sir Oliver Lodge, during his stay in America, to confide in the public:

DER GEISTERSEER. Astrologer, species moribund but in violent throes, having grappled with extra-terrestrial conditions and achieved large publicity and perishable success, desires resume scientific intercourse with such of the breed as do not consider late divagations unpardonable. Requisites, reason and sanity. Mediums and clairvoyants taboo. My recent doctrines now anathema.

If John Barleycorn could speak:

WITH ALL THY FAULTS I LOVE THEE, STILL. Friend of man, ancient family on last legs, having grappled with bellicose Prohibitionists and achieved invisible and unendurable success, desires resume convivial intercourse with such of breed as do not consider thirst ignoble. Requisites, mouths and throats. Drys and Dryads taboo. Teetotalers anathema.

Mayor Hylan dixit:

SNOW-BOUND. Sachem, of tribe not half extinct enough, having grappled with transit and traffic conditions and achieved Palm Beach with delicate success, desires resume mayoral intercourse with such of breed as may have cleaned up snow in absence. Requisites, nothing much. Nothing much taboo. Nothing much anathema.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Martens and Our Foreign Policy

By LINCOLN COLCORD

Washington, March 8

THE growing belief in Washington that the Department of Justice intends shortly to arrest and cause the deportation of Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, representative in America of the Russian Soviet Government, raises a new point in regard to our foreign policy. The deportation, if effected, will have to be done by the Department of Labor and will virtually result in that Department fixing the diplomatic status of the Soviet Government, thus usurping the powers of the Department of State. The point is set forth clearly by Mr. John E. Milholland in recent correspondence with the Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, publication of which is authorized by both.

Mr. Milholland touched on the question only incidentally in a letter in regard to treatment of alien members of the Communist party, but his words reveal one of the dangerous and equivocal aspects of the deportation policy by which the Administration is attempting to stifle advocacy in this country of any fundamental changes in our political or economic system. Mr. Milholland, in his letter to Secretary Wilson, says that he understands that a warrant has been issued by the Department of Labor for Mr. Martens. "Since Martens is not a member of the Communist party in America, this warrant must be based on his membership in the Communist party of Russia, or on his association with a Government which is at present dominated by the political forces represented by the Third Internationale," Mr. Milholland continues. "If Martens be arrested and deported, you will be in the position of having ruled against the admission into America of any member of the dominant political party in Russia; in other words, the responsibility will rest upon you of decision in an important phase of American foreign policy. I need not point out the distressing possibilities involved in this situation; if the Soviet Government were in the meanwhile recognized, as now seems likely, your decision would have to be overruled; and in any case, you would be innocently projected into delicate international relations, for your Department of Labor then becomes *de facto*, at least, the Department of State."

Mr. Milholland's letter, aside from its allusion to the Martens issue, is a trenchant criticism of the Administration's deportation policy. Secretary Wilson, in defending his course, bases it on the immigration legislation of Congress, but obviously has to accept the responsibility for his interpretation of such law, which is the crux of the whole question.

The genesis of the correspondence is as follows: Mr. Milholland on January 24 wrote to Secretary Wilson, suggesting that the time was opportune for a change of policy on his part in the Communist cases, looking toward a rectification of the situation along liberal lines. To this letter Secretary Wilson replied on January 31, enclosing a copy of the decision arrived at in connection with the Communist party, and also a copy of a memorandum of instructions to the Bureau of Immigration concerning counsel and bail for those taken into custody. The decision was presented in the press of January 25. It established, in the case of Englebert Preis, that:

> From these quotations and numerous other statements in the manifesto, not here quoted, it is apparent that the Communist party of America is not merely a political party seeking the control of affairs of state, but a revolutionary party seeking to conquer and destroy the state in open combat. And the only conclusion is that the Communist party of America is an organization that believes in, teaches, and advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. It does not devolve upon the Secretary of Labor officially to determine whether Congress was wise in creating the law, or the Communist party wise in creating the facts. It is his duty to apply the law to the facts as he finds them. It is mandatory upon him to take into custody aliens who are members of this organization and deport them in the manner provided for in the Immigration act of February 5, 1917.

The memorandum of instructions to the Bureau of Immigration, issued by the Secretary of Labor on January 26, provided for a return to the ruling of December 30, 1919, respecting counsel and bail for those taken into custody, making it possible for the defendant to obtain counsel at his first hearing and to be admitted to bail pending further hearings.

Mr. Milholland replied to Mr. Wilson's letter as follows:

HON. W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I have waited a few days to think over the matter of your letter of January 31st before answering it.

The issue is fundamental in its seriousness and importance, I think we all agree. Every man of us, in such a case, must strive to clear up his position; to know and to state exactly where he stands.

First of all, let me congratulate you upon the new instructions which you have sent out to the Bureau of Immigration, making it possible for aliens to have counsel at their first hearings and to obtain and avail themselves of bail. This is an act of simple justice, Mr. Secretary, and you will be universally honored for it. While I constantly discount the emotional tales that spring from such an occasion as this, I cannot but recognize that in the present instance certain injustices were done. These, I believe, occurred mainly through the ruling which you have now corrected. Within your interpretation of the whole question, I could not, as a plain citizen interested in the cause of justice, ask for a fairer or a braver act.

I hope that you will not misunderstand me, however, when I say that, over and above the rectification of detail and administration, I cannot wholly agree with your interpretation of the main question. There is a delicate point of decision in the matter, which makes a world of difference in the result; and I am bound in friendship and honor to say that I believe you have taken the wrong side of that delicate decision. It is like reaching a fork in the road; a single step puts you on the new path, but before you know it, you are miles away from your original direction.

Charles E. Hughes, in a statement from the New York Bar Association to the Assembly at Albany in the recent case of the Socialist Assemblymen, laid down this fundamental principle: "It is the essence of the institutions of liberty that it be recognized that guilt is personal and cannot be attributed to the holding of opinions, or to mere interest, in the absence of overt acts."

This basic principle of liberty, Mr. Secretary, runs like a gold thread through the whole fabric of American history. It was written into the Declaration of Independence and into the Constitution of the United States. It was laid down in speeches

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and writings of our honored fathers. It is to be found in the Constitution of the State of Massachusetts, written by John Adams and adopted in 1780, and in every State Constitution adopted since that day. And our forefathers knew exactly what they were doing when they insisted that the commission of an overt act be the legal limitation upon freedom of speech and opinion. They had at their command the history of freedom of expression in England, where, in spite of the present popular conception, opinion had never up to that time succeeded in freeing itself from bureaucratic control; and they definitely wished to depart from the Blackstonian theory.

When our forefathers wrote into the Declaration of Independence the principle of the right of revolution, they meant precisely what they said. They meant specifically that any man should be free to advocate revolution, until such time as he committed an overt act or an overt act resulted from his expression of opinion. It is the holding to this principle which up to the present time has made America free above all other nations, and the American Government the safest government under the sun.

I think you know me well enough, Mr. Secretary, to believe that I am not a revolutionist, and that I do not want to change or to see changed the form of our government. But I believe with the most profound conviction that the strength of our institutions consists in their inherent right and justice, that these qualities are self-sufficient and self-demonstrative, and that the safety of our beloved nation lies in complete freedom of opinion and expression. Let me preach revolution up and down the streets, and let the Government answer by acts of right and justice. If the time ever came, Mr. Secretary, when the Government could not so answer, when the words of the revolutionists were true and their wrongs and grievances assumed large proportions, then you and I together, out of sincere conviction, would be forced to join with them, and help make another revolution such as our forefathers made provision for; but the abandonment of this basic principle, the attempt to limit opinion and circumscribe expression, is the first step in admission of the inability of the Government to answer and silence the agitators in open forum.

So much for the philosophy of the case. As to the case itself, I cannot see that any quotation which you have instanced from the documents of the Communist party constitutes an overt act, or anything beyond an expression of revolutionary opinion. We have been familiar since 1848 with the jargon of Socialism, and this jargon, of course, runs throughout the Communist literature. I will not usurp your time for a detailed discussion of the quotations on which you base your ruling; we both are familiar with what the Communists are trying to do, and with what they have apparently succeeded in doing in Russia, and there is no disposition on my part to quibble over phrases and definitions. The Communists propose to seize the power of the state, to destroy the present form of political and governmental machinery, and to set up another form of politics and government. They have their reasons, their ideas, their arguments; it is not true, of course, that they propose to destroy all government. In a word, they are out for a revolution.

Well, Mr. Secretary, I maintain that they must be free to advocate this revolution, and that the sole strength of our present form of politics and government lies in the ability to answer and demolish their reasons, ideas and arguments. Your own undivided efforts along these lines illustrate my contentions regardless of whether your point of view agrees or differs with mine in the case you discussed. We will get nowhere by attempting to suppress them; for by that act alone we will give them a new argument stronger than all their dogma and doctrine. Need I remind you of that great political safety valve of the British Empire—Hyde Park Corner—where any man or woman is permitted to say anything and everything he pleases on any subject? Left alone, and given freedom of expression, they could not bring their revolution to pass; I could not have real faith in our present institutions if I were not willing to make that statement. If their revolution ever comes to pass in America, Mr. Secretary, *we will have made it for them by suppression.*

It is in this light that I am forced to view the decision which you have come to respecting the deportation of members of the Communist party. I believe the results of this act will be to greatly strengthen the movement which you desire to suppress; a movement with which I, too, find myself wholly out of sympathy, but which I desire to see suppressed by the inherent strength of our institutions and the native force of our ideas rather than by the exercise of the police power.

It all comes down to this, Mr. Secretary, if we have faith in our institutions, why should we be afraid to subject them to any test of agitation or discussion?

Permit me to point out further a difficulty of considerable proportions to which I fear your decision may lead in the near future. I understand that a warrant has been issued by your Department for the arrest of Martens, the Soviet representative. Since Martens is not a member of the Communist party in America, this warrant must be based on his membership in the Communist party of Russia, or on his association with a Government which is at present dominated by the political forces represented by the Third Internationale. If Martens be arrested and deported, you will be in the position of having ruled against the admission into America of any member of the dominant political party in Russia; in other words, the responsibility will rest upon you of decision in an important phase of American foreign policy. I need not point out the distressing possibilities involved in this situation; if the Soviet Government were in the meanwhile recognized, as now seems likely, your decision would have to be overruled; and in any case, you would be innocently projected into delicate international relations, for your Department of Labor then becomes *de facto*, at least, the Department of State.

I fully realize, Mr. Secretary, the disturbing nature of the position in which you have found yourself with respect to these Communist cases. I appreciate the limitations and requirements of the law under which you are obliged to operate, and the delicacy of the whole situation which you have confronted; and my heart has gone out to you in the crisis. But I do sincerely believe that you could have carried all before you on the basis of the fundamental issue, and could have done an immeasurable service to the country by establishing public opinion on the foundation of real freedom and true Americanism. As the case now stands, public opinion is in an unhealthy and dangerous condition. Our institutions have not really been protected by the suppression of the Communist party; rather, I believe that they have been seriously undermined.

The ideas that I have expressed in this letter, Mr. Secretary, are not my own. I have only read and pondered them; they are the ideas of the wisest statesmen of the world, derived from all the history of human aspiration and endeavor towards the goal of freedom. They have been proved over and over again by tears and blood. They are based on the simple elements of human nature. Men cannot be driven; they must be led. Men respect justice, and follow truth; but arbitrary power they have broken with their hands since the beginning of time, and will continue to break until the end.

But I hesitate always to end a letter on a note of pessimism. Why does not this whole incident, Mr. Secretary, open up a wonderful opportunity for constructive action on your part?

You know my position on the question of our present immigration laws, and I think I have an inkling of where you stand in the matter.

If you were to call upon Congress today for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the whole subject of our immigration legislation, and to advise and report new legislation —in short, to overhaul the immigration situation completely— it would be a dramatic stroke of which the country would approve most emphatically.

You believe the immigration situation to be inadequately cov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ered by existing statutes. This lack has now resulted in the development of a great public question—namely, the cause of the Communists, which throws the whole subject open wide. This would be your position. I believe that a call for a Congressional investigation would be a telling stroke. It could hardly fail to produce constructive changes; it certainly would relieve you of a responsibility under the existing law which Congress has no right to impose upon an executive officer.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN E. MILHOLLAND

After a further unimportant exchange of correspondence Secretary Wilson under date of February 28 made the following exhaustive analysis of his position in the Communist cases:

HON. JOHN E. MILHOLLAND,
Lafayette Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Milholland:

I am in receipt of your letter of February 25th, asking if I have any objections to the publication of our recent "passage at arms" over the immigration and deportation question.

Of course, my only contribution to the "passage at arms" was that of furnishing you copies of my instructions relative to counsel and bail for detained aliens and my decision relative to the Communist party. Not having in mind the possibility of the correspondence being given to the public, I had not attempted to answer the criticisms contained in your letter of February 7th, believing that in some of our conversations I might have the opportunity of making my attitude on the whole subject matter clear to you, and yet there are some of the statements and implications of that letter, based upon an inadequate analysis of the problem, that I would not want to go unchallenged if the matter is to be one of public debate.

The spirit permeating the entire communication does honor to your high ideals of human liberty, with which I am in complete accord.

It should be clearly understood that the instructions sent out by me to the Bureau of Immigration on January 26th were not *new* instructions, but were a reiteration of old instructions, as the context of the order shows. These instructions had been carefully considered and made a part of the Immigration Rules long before the question became one of general public interest, not because of any sympathy with those who came within the purview of the law but as a means of preserving the rights of all and protecting those who were innocent. They had been amended by administrative action December 30, 1919, so as to deny the right of counsel until after the preliminary hearings had been held, and were promptly restored to their former character upon the matter being brought to my attention.

It should be further understood that there is nothing in the law and nothing in my decision that denies the principle of the right of revolution. The people of the United States have on two separate occasions conducted successful revolutions: First, by force of arms during the Revolutionary War, but even that Revolution was justified in the Declaration of Independence only upon the ground of the right of one people to sever its political connection with another after a long train of abuses and usurpations by the Government of the other people, in the conduct of which our people had no voice, had evinced a design to reduce them under absolute despotism. No attempt was made to justify the use of force to accomplish any revolution in a democracy where the people have the power to direct, control, and change their own Government by parliamentary methods. Second, by the adoption of the Federal Constitution, abolishing the old Confederacy and establishing a new Government by peaceful parliamentary processes, clearly demonstrating the principle, proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence, of the right of the people to alter or to abolish their Government and institute a new Government, and that it could be accomplished by parliamentary methods where the people had a voice in directing their own affairs. The eighteen amendments to the Constitution have given additional evidence of the power of the people peacefully to change their form of government.

The existing law and my interpretation of it does not in any manner abrogate or interfere with that right. It does, however, prohibit the belief in, teaching or advocating the use of force by aliens to accomplish this purpose, or membership in any organization that believes in, teaches, or advocates these things. As to the wisdom of the law, I have not expressed any official opinion. Personally, however, I look upon any alien who comes to this country and advocates the use of force for the overthrow of our Government as being in exactly the same position as an invading enemy, and that it is no undue hardship to send him back to the country whence he came. Nevertheless, I would not deal with the subject matter in that way. In dealing with it during the period of the war the policy of the Department of Labor was to send high-class, intelligent working men, who had lived the lives and spoke the language of the workers themselves, into the places where working men congregate, carrying a counter-propaganda puncturing the fallacy of the philosophy of force as applied to democratic institutions. We believed we had successfully met the situation until Congress in its wisdom curtailed the appropriation that made it possible for us to carry on the work we had been doing.

If lawfully admitted aliens are to be deported from the United States for any cause, in my judgment the deportation should be the result of judicial proceedings in the courts rather than through administrative action. The theory of the law, however, as I have understood it, has been that these are not criminal proceedings; that these people are not being deported because they have been convicted of crime, but because they are aliens whose conduct makes them undesirable residents of the United States. It has therefore been made an administrative function and placed in the hands of the Secretary of Labor to execute. He would be setting himself up as superior to the law of the land if he undertook to set aside the plain letter of the law because his own judgment was that a different policy should be pursued.

I have given you these expressions of my personal viewpoint in order that you might better understand my official determination of the question. You will observe in the decision itself that I place emphasis upon the fact that belief in, teaching, or advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States is not alone sufficient to bring the organization within the scope of the act; that there must be in addition a belief in, teaching, or advocacy of force or violence to accomplish the purpose.

You say that you cannot see that any quotation which I have instanced from the documents of the Communist party constitutes an overt act. The overt act is the act of joining or becoming affiliated with an organization that teaches the use of force or violence. That is an affirmative act on the part of the individual himself, the object of which he declares to be the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. The Communist party completely sewed itself up when it required as a condition of membership that the applicants must have read the constitution and program of the Communist party and declared their adherence to the principles and tactics of the party and the Communist Internationale. The portions of the manifestos quoted clearly demonstrate the purpose to use force and accentuate the distinction between capturing the bourgeois parliamentary state and their purpose to conquer and destroy it. And if anything further is needed to make sure of the purpose, it is set forth in the declaration that "the revolutionary era compels the proletariat to make use of the means of battle which will concentrate its entire energies, namely, mass action, with its logical resultant, *direct conflict with the governmental machinery* in open combat. All other methods, such as *revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentar-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism, will be of only secondary significance." Whatever may be said about the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the legal methods provided for dealing with the question, I am clear in my own mind that I have decided this case in accordance with the law and the facts, and if the people desire any change, their efforts should be directed towards a repeal of the law rather than against its enforcement.

It may be well to call your attention to my action in connection with the Industrial Workers of the World, charged with being an organization of similar character. The Department, through the Bureau of Immigration, made an exhaustive investigation into its laws and practices. There was revealed a mass of literature advocating sabotage and other proscribed policies, some of it over the signatures of some of the officers, some of it over the signatures of members who are not officers, and most of it bearing the imprint of the initials of the organization as though officially issued by it. These facts seemed to me to make a strong case against the officers of the organization, but I have been unable to convince myself that a case against the officers of an organization is a case against the organization itself. Any organization may be formed for a perfectly lawful purpose and yet have officers who use the influence and prestige that their official position gives to them to do unlawful things in their own name or in the name of the organization. In such cases it has seemed to me that the information upon which warrants are based must show participation in or guilty knowledge of the unlawful acts on the part of the alien in order to justify the issuance of a warrant of arrest for purposes of deportation. Consequently, I have held that mere membership in the Industrial Workers of the World does not make an alien deportable within the terms of the act.

The distinction between the Industrial Workers of the World and the Communist party is that the illegal action is in the first case that of the officers, without proof that they had the sanction of the organization itself, and in the second case it is the illegal action of the organization, to which the members are required to subscribe as a condition precedent to admission.

This is my present attitude concerning the subject, which I am constrained to continue unless it is shown that my interpretation of the law or the facts is wrong.

With this response to your criticisms, I shall be willing to have you give such publicity to the correspondence as your own good judgment may dictate.

Sincerely yours,
W. B. WILSON,
Secretary

The Turk Looks Eastward

By LELAND REX ROBINSON

THE Turk is looking eastward toward the Central Asiatic steppes from which he came. His eye glances over the barrier of Armenian territory to his kinsmen the Tartars in the eastern and southern Caucasus. It is not an insurmountable barrier, he finds. Beyond the Caspian are Turkoman tribes also of Mongol or "Turanian" descent. During centuries when he wielded power the Turk never forgot the racial and religious ties that bound him to these subject races of Czarist Russia. His interest was double-edged—a common descent and a common faith.

He is looking eastward as never before because the Russian Empire is a thing of the past and there is none to stay him. The Allies have shorn him of most of his borrowed glory, and never again will his flag touch the sparkling waters of the tropics. They are even seriously debating cutting off his imperial head. While they debate, a cunning instinct whispers to him that all is not lost if he will conveniently flatten out under this pressure from north and south, veer to the east, and become master in his own house by establishing a solid corridor of power from the Aegean Sea through Asia Minor, the Russian Caucasus, and Turkestan to the northern frontiers of India. Thus fortified, and in control of the trans-Caspian railway he could threaten India with the aid of his tribal kinsmen.

This idea of inciting disloyalty among Russia's Moslem subjects is not new to the Turk. It corresponded on his part to the Czar's historical demand for a protectorate over Christian subjects of the Sultan, and was always in his mind when he matched pennies with Russia. The plan grew more fascinating as it became more practicable, and to understand the present situation we must briefly picture events in the land north of Persia, and between the Black and Caspian Seas, from the time that the Bolshevik collapse first opened wide the doors of the Russian Caucasus to Ottoman troops and propagandists.

The interval between Brest-Litovsk, March, 1918, and the Armistice in November of 1918, was a fool's paradise for the Turk. The Russian Bear had died of self-made wounds. The promised land was open and cities fell like the trumpeted walls of Jericho. The Turk struck far beyond the territories returned by the Bolshevik treaty. Intoxicated by his pinchbeck victories, he forgot the odds against his allies on the western front, neglected military operations in Syria and Mesopotamia, and dug away toward the Caspian, oblivious as the ground hog.

At first the Caucasians took measures of self-defense. To escape anarchy following the Bolshevik break-up, a government "of all the Caucasus" had been established in Tiflis, the former Russian provincial capital. A hastily summoned assembly, with representatives of the Armenian, Tartar, and Georgian peoples, voted to continue the war. New rubles fell hot from the press. Armenian contingents of the old imperial army were reorganized, equipped where picking was good, and sent off under brave leaders of their own choice to protect the fortress of Kars and adjacent regions. The Georgians sent some men westward to Batum and vicinity on the Black Sea coast with orders to fight if necessary. The Tartars were to look to the safety of the east Caucasus.

Then the perfectly obvious happened. The Georgians had reasonable assurance of their own security, and argued that they might as well pin their hope of independence on the Germans as the Allies. They concluded more was to be gained by negotiation than by fighting, and accordingly, they negotiated more than they fought. The Armenians remained stoutly pro-Ally. A nation which had lost one-third of its people through Turkish persecution was not in the mood to argue with the Turks. When the Sultan's soldiers bore down upon Kars in crushing force the Armenian garrison destroyed the city, and from its encircling ring of mountain fortifications the approaching Turks looked down upon a bleak valley of smoking débris. The Tartars made not a move against their co-religionists the Turks. The steps which were eventually taken to protect Baku form one of the most interesting chapters in the history of the war, but the credit for the sturdy, if unsuccessful, defense belongs to the Russians of Admiral Kolchak's Caspian fleet, the Armenians,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and their few British leaders, who had worried some supplies up through Persia from the Bagdad base.

After seizing most of that part of old Turkish Armenia which Russia had appropriated since 1815, the Turk's immediate objective became the rich oil port of Baku on the Caspian, and from that point, if possible, the control of the inland sea and its eastern port and rail terminus, Krasnovodsk. As the German high command foresaw final collapse in France, it indulged these dreams of the Ottoman allies in order to command their loyalty to the last.

The capture of Baku, in mid-September, 1918, was the Turk's last military triumph. The evacuation was on such short notice that as the victors rushed down the bare slopes of the Caspian foothills they saw beyond the derricks of the neighboring oil fields a harbor full of fleeing ships. The British withdrew to the north Persian port of Enzeli, the end of their Bagdad-Caspian "line of communication." Russians active in the defense sailed to other ports. Not more than forty thousand from an Armenian population double that number were able to make good their escape in the three score or more available ships. When the latter reached the Persian coast they were the strangest host of war sufferers that ever escaped Turkish vengeance. They represented the dominant business class of the world's premier oil city, but had neither shoes for their feet nor food for their starving children.

Within two months, defeat in France blazed large across the western sky, and the Armistice required a final ouster of the Turks. As they retreated in the direction of Asia Minor, they gloated over two very definite things that had been accomplished during their short occupation of Baku.

The first was irretrievable. Thirty thousand Armenians had been butchered in the streets of the metropolis. The 15th, 16th, and 17th of September were devoted to this bloody orgy and no home was safe from the armed bands of Tartar hoodlums issuing out of Baku's underworld. An offended laborer might cut the throat of his employer with impunity, defile his wife, and make way with his daughters. Months later we identified such men peddling flowers unmolested on the city streets. I can still see the venerable Armenian Bishop Bagratte in his shell-torn library as he told me the sufferings of those days. When I read his fearless statements to the Turkish officials I called him the Cardinal Mercier of the Caucasus. As late as last fall the Armenian school on a near-by boulevard was filled with close lines of orphan cots from the ground floor to the spacious auditorium. The Armenian schools are all closed this winter—each one an orphanage or a hospital. The limits to this reign of terror were fixed by the practical necessity of preserving enough Armenian brains to run the oil refineries which are the basis of government revenue, and to keep the arteries of business open. The rest of the survivors were to be victimized at Turk and Tartar leisure.

A second attainment was the organization of a Tartar government with its seat at Baku. It is better known as the "Azerbaidjian Republic," and its power extends roughly on the Caspian coast from the Caucasus Mountains to the Persian border, inland towards Tiflis along the line of the trans-Caucasian railway, and southwest to the borders of the Armenian Government described below. The Azerbaidjian Republic bore the Turk and German impress. It was designed as a pillar of Turkish influence. Of course it "promised" the usual immunities to Armenian survivors and all other citizens regardless of race or creed. When a few thousand British followed at the heels of the retreating Turks and again went into barracks in Baku in mid-November, this Tartar government continued to function. It "regretted the indiscretions of September." From now on it would be a good government, progressive and just. Under a truly constitutional régime, "the lion would lie down with the lamb." The position of the British was none too secure. They in their turn would coöperate with the "government." They would only concern themselves with "foreign affairs."

To understand these "foreign affairs" let us bear in mind that two other governments had been organized before this time by racial groups in the Caucasus. West of Baku lay the "Georgian Republic." Before the armistice the Georgians had seized the power in Tiflis, midway point on the Batum-Baku railway, and proclaimed their independence in an indefinite territory of the northern, central, and west-central Caucasus. Much to their regret, Batum and the nearby Black Sea Coast were later occupied and administered by the British forces from Constantinople, who held the port as an Anglo-Russian dependency.

There was an "Erivan Government" as well, some hundred miles south of Tiflis. Between these two cities the Turkish armies had passed toward Baku, looting, destroying, killing. They had been held from Erivan by a short but disastrous battle in which the Armenians showed once more their fighting calibre. The "Armenian Republic" was established after the successful defense of Erivan, and in various ways the British encouraged its claims to a territory stretching from the Black Sea Coast south of Batum to the limits of Georgia and Azerbaidjian on the north and east, and to the Persian border on the south. Pending the settlement of the Turkish question the "Erivan Government" was content to see its writ end near the eastern border of Asia Minor. Nevertheless it has from the first claimed to be spokesman for the Armenian race, whose rightful domain includes the far greater territory of Turkish Armenia and stretches beyond Erzerum and Van to the limits of Anatolia, embracing the Black Sea coast almost to Samsoun, and even Cilicia on the southwest with its Mediterranean coast.

These three peoples have no love for one another. They have quarrelled over provisional boundary settlements. In disputes between Tartars and Armenians there has been an evident purpose, generally on the part of the former, to feed the flames of racial and religious hatred. There have been in the background larger questions of the relation of these governments with the Allies and the anti-Bolshevik factions on the one side, and the Soviet Government on the other.

The Armenians, for instance, were confident that the Allies would approve their efforts to unite Russian with Turkish Armenia and win the independence of the united nation. The independence of Russian Armenia has been grudgingly conceded by the Allies, and the relief efforts of the Near East Committee have been backed to some extent by advances from America to the "Erivan Government" in the form of wheat and beans delivered through the American Relief Administration.

The Georgians and Tartars, on their part, have not suffered Turkish misrule. They have not been regarded as especially oppressed under the Russian Empire. Their independence was an internal problem of the Russian Revolution and not an issue of the war. To put it plainly, Georgians and Tartars had strong reason to stand together in the common defense of their newly asserted "rights."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If we examine why an ancient Christian race, the Georgians, should find themselves bed-fellows of the Tartars and at variance with the Armenians, we will understand the ticklish position of the British in Baku and the Caucasus generally from the time of their return in November. Of all the Russian border states from the Caspian to the Baltic only Armenia, Poland, and Finland had any assurance that the Russian Whites and their Allied supporters would concede their independence. Kolchak refused even provisional recognition. Denikin minced no words in referring such matters to an all-Russian constituent assembly of the indefinite future. It was the avowed intention of both leaders to preserve for post-Bolshevik Russia her needed approaches to the sea. With these policies the Georgians and Tartars knew that the Allies must be in greater or less accord. This was certainly true of America.

Especially in those days when Kolchak's troops were pushing vigorously westward and Moscow seemed within striking distance of Denikin's Cossacks, Lenin was worldly-wise enough to offer self-determination to any group whose support he needed. Under these circumstances it was not easy for the British to hold off Denikin from Baku on the one hand, and on the other to assure him of his oil from that Tartar port. Straddling a diplomatic fence in Baku, they offered a smooth cheek to Denikin on the north and his enemies the Tartars on the south. Too weak to maintain their position on any other than a basis of "friendly cooperation," the British were compelled to overlook the most abominable abuses in internal administration and to ignore the growing undercurrent of Bolshevist sentiment in Georgia and Azerbaidjian. One day last September I read on a public sign board in Baku a revolutionary appeal in English issued by Lenin and evidently intended for British soldiers. A week later it was still there.

The collapse of Denikin and Kolchak has made the Caucasus situation more difficult for the Allies as long as they remain at war with Trotzky. If possible, there is worse confusion. It is conceivable that these Baku and Tiflis governments fear a victorious Lenin as much as an Ally-supported Denikin, and that their interest lies in keeping strong government of any kind from their northern borders. It is reported that representatives of the Georgians and Tartars in Paris are requesting protection from the Allies. Knowing something, however, of the sympathies of the masses in these regions, I believe there are many tongues in many cheeks during these informal exchanges. Britain's recent movement of soldiers to the Caucasus and battleships to the Black Sea leaves us no ground to doubt the present menace to rail connections across the Caucasus and the possibility of the Red control of water routes from Constantinople to Batum.

Further south, Turkish agitators have taken every advantage of the very lenient terms of the Armistice. Complete demobilization of the Ottoman armies was not required in this instrument, and Armenia of the Caucasus—and of Turkey as well—has been left with hardly an Allied squad or a single well-armed garrison. Within the limits of Russian Armenia more than two hundred thousand destitute refugees are waiting to cross the Turk-barred border to their looted vineyards, gardens, and villages. Turkish nationalists, often with the secret connivance of Constantinople officials, have been inciting Moslem tribes against this hard-beset nation and hacking a way to the Caspian over bodies of the slain. Tartars have responded on the south and east to the pressure of Turks and Kurds on the west and north, and held Armenia in a grip that has negatived her every effort at recovery. They organized two considerable massacres during 1919. The fault of the Armenians is that the highway of power which links Kurds and Turks and their Mohammedan kinsmen of the east runs across the territory of this Christian race, and the former are enforcing an eminent domain of their own.

The propaganda which urges Moslems of Mongol or Turanian descent to unite in common cause is known as Pan-Turanianism. It is stronger than Pan-Islamism because it is not so inclusive, because it emphasizes the racial tie among similar peoples, and, in this instance, at least, has a unique chance for immediate expression. Pan-Turanianism may yet succeed in completing the extermination of the Armenian nation if it can continue to incite racial fanaticism as successfully as heretofore. The ancient Persians had a saying that "the thief loves a troubled market."

At Brest-Litovsk, and beyond, the Turks bit off more than they could swallow. They have had a strong purgative, but now they are gaining by intrigue what they lost by force. At first they were cowed by defeat. They expected a strong nation like America to assume wide mandatory powers. With time and inaction, their hopes rose once more; they applied themselves with new cunning and the last state is worse than the first.

Through indifference, the Allies have allowed a condition to develop which is critical in the extreme. Lack of a vigorous policy in the Caucasus has encouraged the Bolsheviki, hindered the pacification of northwest Persia, menaced the Armenian nation, spread unrest and open defiance in Turkey, and greatly weakened the entire Allied position in the Near East.

The indifference of the Allies in the Caucasus has been partly due to their all-absorbing political struggles in Turkey. Greece has occupied Smyrna, and sent her troops far beyond the region agreed upon by Lloyd George and Venizelos. Devastation in the beautiful Meander Valley bears mute witness to this. Italy has seized Adalia and part of its rich hinterland. There are rumblings of a bitter contest between the two nations. Compelled to share Syria with England, France demands Cilicia, but Armenians regard this as their natural, as it has been their historical, Mediterranean outlet. America's failure to assume a mandate for Armenia, or Anatolia, or Constantinople, has raised the question whether another power equally trusted by all the races concerned and in any sense acceptable to France, Italy, and England can be found, and in the interval imperialists of each nation are imagining the advantages that might accrue from the extension of their several exclusive spheres of influence in the vast unsettled territory. The rivalry of France and England cannot be localized in Syria; it is reaching north, even to the Bosphorus.

The Allies, too, have been angling in muddy waters. Vicious and dangerous as Turkish propaganda has become in Asia Minor and the Caucasus, we must remember that its source was in part a legitimate nationalist movement in Asia Minor. The Allies have violated the Turkish armistice in letter and in spirit. The Turk looks eastward with new determination partly because he fears he has not a fighting chance to thwart European imperialism in those portions of western Asia Minor which belong to him.

Earl Curzon spoke much to the point recently. "I believe," he is quoted as saying in Parliament, "that every one of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great powers would have abandoned the greater part of its individual ambition if it could be persuaded that America would come in and bear her share of the burden as mandatory for the whole Turkish Empire." This means that under an American mandate rival claims in Asia Minor might have been dropped just because they are "rival." Greece is mainly concerned for the safety and equal opportunity of Greeks in coast towns of Asia Minor. She does not wish Italy to steal a march on her in the control of the Aegean, but she would not insist upon controlling these cities herself. Italians wish full opportunity of exploiting the mines of the Adalia district, and such a guarantee would go far toward satisfying them.

The time has come when the interests of Armenia have become synonymous with the interests of the world. The future of this little nation embedded in the mountains of Asia Minor and the Caucasus is not alone a humanitarian problem. It is a very urgent political one. Unless a strong Allied policy, consistent and dictated by motives of the purest unselfishness and the most impartial justice, is immediately adopted and backed by the needed force, we shall see the shambles of Asia Minor changed into a breeding spot of world wars which will put the Balkans to shame.

I say Armenia because Armenia is the heart of the problem. Recognized independence and a strong mandate for its united Russian and Turkish portions would block Pan-Turanian agitation, discourage Bolshevism—its twin brother of disturbance—force decency into the government policies of Baku, protect Persia, and, perhaps, even thwart the menace to India of tribal uprisings among the Turkomans of the trans-Caspian provinces. On the west, such a policy would cow Turks and Kurds who are holding Armenian villages in daily fear of new massacres, and hold in check the newly organized "Kingdom of the Kurds" over which Enver Pasha presides in regal state. By bringing to inglorious end the cynical plottings of European states for the distribution of Asia Minor it would give the Turks, the Kurds, and the Greeks the assurance of a fair deal on the basis of genuine racial adjustment. It would permit repatriation, and the sower would walk in his fields again; it would permit immediate alimentation, and the laborers could be saved who must garner the next crop in their homeland.

America has a second choice if she will not accept the mandate. We may recognize the complete independence of Armenia, and, with the "Erivan Government" as a starting point, hasten at least the provisional fixing of the nation's western boundaries. Locally, the moral effect of such a step on our part would be incalculable. Adequate government loans could be made to the new nation, largely in the form of food and clothing. Working agreements could be drawn for the proper control and use of these loans. Such material aid would work miracles in staying unrest and strengthening trustworthy native leaders.

Should America use her influence for strengthening an independent Armenia, the Turkish peasant of Anatolia will see a strong buffer state reconstituted on its ancient domain between him and his Tartar kinsmen of Caspian regions. He would be assured of fair treatment for his fellow Turks in Armenia. He would see the same promise of nationhood for his own race in the territory which is predominantly Turkish. With his feet on the bed rock of good government, he would stolidly go back to work and listen no more to the siren songs of mischievous politicians. The immediate causes for his looking eastward would have been removed.

England Prepares for More War

By HERBERT W. HORWILL

London, February 17

"THE slump in exchanges," says General Maurice, "has done more to prepare the way for real peace than months of talk in Paris." Never before has the professional economist had such an opportunity of addressing a popular audience. The journals that most pride themselves on their alertness in catching the attention of the man in the street have been "featuring," on their front pages, articles in which experts make the mysteries of international exchange plain to the meanest intelligence. News of a type that is ordinarily hidden away in the financial column is nowadays promoted to rank with double murders and sensational divorce cases. A daily bulletin, recording the value of the pound in New York at the moment of going to press, now occupies one of the most prominent positions in one's morning newspaper, and is a perpetual reminder of the muddle into which present-day statesmanship has brought the world's affairs.

Meanwhile, the national leaders are still plunging recklessly ahead in the old fashion. Winston Churchill, the Secretary for War, has been expounding his scheme for the new Territorial Army, and it confirms one's worst anticipations. At the close of the war that was to end war, this force is to be increased from 314,000 to 345,000. Whereas the old force was to be exclusively for home defense and a Territorial could not be sent abroad against his will, the new one is to be raised on the basis of imperial defense, and imperial defense is to be interpreted to include the fulfillment of responsibilities to France and Belgium. The new Territorial is to be safeguarded, however, by the proviso that he will not be liable for service overseas until Parliament has passed a special act authorizing the dispatch of the force abroad in a national emergency. There is really no need for him to be alarmed, for "the Government," Mr. Churchill assures him, "cannot contemplate any war which is not truly a national war. We cannot contemplate any war which is not undertaken in self-defense and in defense of life and honor, and in defense of the prime, massive, vital interests of the British race and realm." Troublesome critics are asking whether, if this new Territorial force had been in existence last year, a Parliament such as the present one would have refused to pass an act authorizing Mr. Churchill to mobilize all fourteen Territorial divisions and send them to Archangel.

In spite of general belief in Mr. Asquith among the Liberals there is a group that thinks that until the party gets rid of him, it has not the remotest chance of revival. It is all very well, they say, for him to advocate the revision of the peace treaty, non-intervention in Russia, a sound financial policy, and so on. But they remind us that he did not speak out on any of these matters until it was clear to everybody that the Coalition had lost the support of the country. Further, the failure of the Paris Conference was largely due to the existence of secret treaties for which he was responsible, and even in his election campaign he has shown himself so little repentant that he has been deliberately defending the secret treaty with Italy. These objectors believe that Mr. Asquith's leadership has been the bane of the Liberal party. They profoundly distrust him, and have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no reason to doubt that, if the opportunity came, he would deceive his followers and the nation again as he has deceived them before. They foresee that, if he is confirmed in the leadership, the number of Liberals who have shaken off their party allegiance will be greatly increased, and it will include everybody who has any real grip of Liberal principles.

As far as the immediate situation is concerned, there is much to be said for the opinion expressed by one of the weekly newspapers that the "pivotal man" in British politics is neither Mr. Asquith nor the Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister's present deputy in the House of Commons. It is not at all unlikely that, within a short time, Lloyd George may wish to dissolve Parliament. But he will not be able to secure a dissolution unless he can get Bonar Law's consent to that policy. Indeed, if the King should receive from the Prime Minister a request for a dissolution that was not compelled by a defeat in Parliament, the constitutional course would be to refuse it, and to ask some other person to form a Ministry and carry on the Government. As leader of by far the strongest single party in the House, Bonar Law would be obviously marked out for that task, and the restiveness of the Unionist rank and file at their present service under an alien head would supply a powerful motive for seizing such an opportunity. It is significant that a meeting of the Central Council of the National Unionist Association is summoned for today at which an attempt will be made to press for a reaffirmation of the fundamental principles of the Unionist party, especially with the object of guiding Unionists as to their attitude to the questions of the House of Lords, Ireland, trade policy, agriculture, nationalization of industries, and the trade unions. The immediate cause of this movement is the anxiety produced among Unionists by the speech of the Prime Minister at Manchester last December, when he declared that the Coalition Government would be prepared to embody in legislation every proposal adopted at the Birmingham meeting of the National Liberal Federation. It is scarcely surprising that a good many true-blue Conservatives should be staggered at finding themselves thus committed to the resolutions of a Liberal caucus.

Everything seems to point to an attempt on the part of the Prime Minister to make nationalization the issue in the event of an appeal to the country. There were many previous indications of this intention, and they were confirmed last week by his quickness in seizing the opening given him, by the advanced claims put forward by one of the less responsible Labor members, for a plausible attempt to tar Labor in general with the Bolshevik brush. The Secretary for War has shown himself, if possible, even more pronounced in his hostility to the Labor party, whose anger he has aroused by the glaring untruth of the charges he brought against it in his speech last Saturday at Dundee. If one might judge from the attention it has received in the press, the nationalization campaign that the miners have been carrying on throughout the country during the winter amounts to nothing. It has almost been ignored in the non-Labor papers. Actually it has been pursued with great energy, and the Labor people claim for it that it has been most effective in influencing public opinion. Several hundred demonstrations have been held, and nearly fifteen million leaflets have been distributed. Much will depend upon the decisions taken at a special meeting of the Trades Union Congress, which will probably be held within the next fortnight.

Although there are still many advertisements of the sales of big estates, tenants are not quite so eager to buy their holdings as they were a few months ago. In fact, it is reported that some who bought their farms last year are already trying to sell them. They have discovered that land ownership in these days is an increasingly perilous venture. The farmer who buys not only becomes liable to a whole series of taxes that were formerly paid by the estate, but he has now to erect and keep in repair all necessary buildings, including laborers' cottages, which, at the present prices, is no slight burden. In the prices they offered in bidding for their farms many tenants, too, failed to take into account the inevitable increase in the cost of production in the near future. An agricultural correspondent of the *Observer* makes himself responsible for the disquieting news that some of the banks are already refusing to accept land as security for mortgages. They have been considering the future, and they do not like the look of it.

In the Driftway

SOMEDAY somebody will reveal the truth about the man of mystery of the Wilson Administration. He is David F. Houston, the new Secretary of the Treasury, one of the original members of Mr. Wilson's Cabinet. There is probably less known about him by the general public than about anybody else of the President's official advisers, with the exception, perhaps, of the Secretary of Labor. Mr. Houston is an extremely reserved man, who shuts up like a clam the instant a newspaper man heaves into sight. Wholly lacking in the instinct for publicity, he says nothing and tends to his job. His public utterances have stirred nobody's pulses and won him no reputation for originality, but he has the high respect and regard of his colleagues. It has always been a case with Mr. Houston of still waters giving the impression that they run very deep. Slow to take positions himself, his seat as Secretary of Agriculture near the bottom of the Cabinet table gave him for seven years the opportunity to sum up the debate when there was debate, and to take sides with the majority. As William Marion Reedy puts it, "Mr. Houston was always on the side of the President from start to finish, never going astray after self-determination," and he suggests that Mr. Houston is in an even more fortunate position to indulge his habit of being silent in seven languages, living and dead, because as Secretary of the Treasury, "he will probably let the money talk."

* * * * *

A FRIEND in New York city, whom the Drifter suspects is a pessimist, notes that the moment New Jersey authorizes 3.50 per cent. liquor the fare by under-river tube from Manhattan is raised from seven to eight cents.

* * * * *

A CORRESPONDENT writes to call attention to the slogan that Senator Chamberlain, of Oregon, has adopted in announcing his candidacy for reëlection: "My country, its preservation and the perpetuation unimpaired of its institutions." The correspondent suggests that the idea of Senator Chamberlain, and similar candidates, would be more accurately expressed if "unimpaired" were replaced by "unimproved." Fortunately, it is not yet regarded as essential that every candidate for office shall have a slogan. Most are satisfied with only a platform—and that supplied by somebody else. In Oklahoma, however, a Single Tax

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democrat, who wants to be sent to Congress, is relying solely upon a slogan. It is: "I Have No Platform—I Stand on the Ground."

* * * * *

THE Drifter is a tomb of confidences and never tells a secret. He even hesitates to share with the world what he has overheard. But some things will not be kept. Life is too bare without them. He must not bury this story in his bosom. He was once at a small inn, not far from New York, at which were staying two women from Brooklyn, mother and daughter, who had nothing to do all day but search the *Eagle* for obituary notices, which they read with the passion of those who are calm in the hope of a blessed immortality, make fancy work for bazaars, and discourse upon the doings of a certain famous congregation of which they are hereditary members. One day they were sitting on the veranda when suddenly the daughter looked up from her *Eagle*. "Oh, mother, I have the most wonderful idea!" "What is it, dear?" "It says here in the paper that King George is coming to this country this fall." "Yes?" "Why not ask Dr. Hillis to get the King to speak at the Henry Ward Beecher celebration?"

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Of Military Training

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The next three months will determine whether or not our two great parties will come before the country with any real or vital issues in the coming election. Recently the President brought into the open one question which has been hovering near the edge of the arena for some time. I refer to universal military training. Forced, by his request for postponement until the San Francisco Convention, to take some stand, Democratic Congressmen voted overwhelmingly against delaying even that long their protest to this feature of the present military bill, a reassuring proof that, after all, our elected representatives are not entirely out of touch with their constituency.

One wonders whether the Democrats will be astute enough to seize an obvious tactical opportunity. The Republicans are in a fair way towards committing themselves to some policy of universal training and conscription already. Their most persistent candidate is a military man, and even though his platform is somewhat vague his stand on this point is clear enough. Mr. Root and Mr. Butler, on behalf of the Big Four in New York, have written it into their platform. It is rumored that Mr. Hays is not prejudiced against it, and labor leaders are continually claiming that business interests of Republican complexion strongly favor it as a step toward better discipline in industry. The Democrats, on the other hand, are in better circumstances. True, Mr. Baker is one of its staunchest advocates, and this recent request of the President seems to indicate an astonishing sympathy for it, but the word of neither of them is carrying as great weight as it did a year ago.

If the Democrats should oppose it on a clear issue, there is reason to believe that they could count immediately on a sympathetic hearing from some 4,000,000 male voters (perhaps less 10 per cent. to cover ex-officers ranking above 2nd lieutenants), who have had recent practical experience with the advantage of such training. Besides these there are the fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters and relatives and next-door neighbors of these same 4,000,000, who have had an opportunity to hear first-hand testimony about the value of military life. Also there are 4,000,000 members of organized labor who have quite definite ideas about its advantages. In fact, the American people have had much more experience with life as it is under military rule than with life as it may be under a League of Nations, and I venture to believe that their mind is more nearly made up about it. Will the Democratic party realize this?

New York, March 3 JOSIAH BRADLEY BUELL

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: An Omaha grade school teacher told me the following:

On a February morning at about 10:30 there was handed to that teacher a request (presumably emanating from the War Department at Washington) to have every child in her class (ranging between 11 and 12 years of age) write an essay on enlistment, to have these written at once and all of the essays returned to the principal not later than 3:30 P. M. of the same day. The teacher had to lay aside her routine work and start at once to give the children an explanation of what enlistment really means and, incidentally, to instil in the children's minds what each was supposed to write. Woe to the teacher whose children did not write in favor of enlistment, or in other words, militarism.

Omaha, Nebraska, February 23 E. G. K.

The Hour for Economic Freedom

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Europe is starving. Any possibility of escape left by the war was destroyed by the inhuman prolongation of the blockade. The war propaganda produced a state of world-wide madness. Truth and mercy withered at its touch. Those who, by the mere chance of birth, escaped the horrible agonies through which the populations of Europe are passing regard the ghastly spectacle with complacency. They are not moved by pity. But another force is beginning to stir them: the instinct of self-interest. They are discovering that human beings are dependent upon one another; that the prostration of Germany and Austria spreads disease and loss to other nations. They begin to see that the breakdown of the financial structure in the Central Empires, at which they piously rejoiced, threatens them with industrial stagnation.

The war not only destroyed an incalculable amount of wealth diverted from useful purposes, but impaired the ability of organized society to produce enough to satisfy the primary needs of the world, or to move the produce to the points of greatest need. Merely as a measure of self-protection something must be done to help our late enemies to their feet, to feed them until they are able to feed themselves. The Supreme Council at Paris is granting shipping facilities; Mr. Hoover is encouraging private charity administered by the Friends; Secretary Glass urges Congress to make loans on suitable terms.

The one remedy that receives no attention is the removal of the artificial barriers which stand in the way of reconstruction. Why, for instance, should hundreds of millions of dollars be raised in loans (the chief weight of which will rest ultimately upon the shoulders of the working classes) while landowners in America and Europe stand at the source of production and take toll for the permission to use the free gifts of nature? And why should governments continue to penalize producers and to restrict the distribution of the life-saving products by taxes which fall upon every useful activity? Before adding fresh burdens to impossible debts statesmen would do well to abolish monopolies under which millions are condemned to starve in order that the parasites may reap their cannibalistic gains.

Lloyd George avers that economic laws may be ignored with impunity. Such flippancy, or madness, is characteristic of statesmen who have piled up civilization upon the rocks. The world has been deaf to Turgot, to Adam Smith, to Henry George. It is reaping the harvest of ignorance. Experience is beginning to drive home a lesson which men would not learn without suf-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fering. It is becoming clear that no avenue of escape is left save that of economic justice. Self-preservation demands it more imperatively every day. An embruted society, deaf to the appeal of fair play, is being driven by inconceivable disaster and the threat of utter disintegration to bow to economic laws.

There is only one issue of political importance in the world today, the twofold issue of economic freedom. The hour has struck for the formation of a radical party pledged to restore the earth to the people and to establish the common rights of all men by cancelling the privileges of the toll gatherers, whether land lords, trade lords or money lords. On such a platform all socialists, labor men, radicals and liberals whose aim is impartial justice could unite and present a solid front to the corrupt forces in control of both traditional parties.

Bryn Mawr, Pa., January 20 FRANK W. GARRISON

The Revision of the Peace Treaties

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Perhaps you will allow one of your English readers, who has served in the Near East during the war, to write to you on this subject.

The folly of the Peace Treaty with Germany is already becoming apparent to the people of Great Britain, and a clearer perception of our own interests will undoubtedly induce us, before long, to agree to a drastic revision of that Treaty. Germany is so important a part of Europe that we cannot afford to ruin her permanently. There is a danger, however, that the fate of the smaller enemy countries will be overlooked, because their despair and desolation will not seriously affect us; yet the conditions already imposed on Austria and Bulgaria are even more intolerable, in some respects, than those imposed on Germany.

The Treaty with Bulgaria, for instance, is a more flagrant violation of the rights of nationality than the Treaty of Versailles. No less than a quarter of the Bulgarian race is now under the rule of our Balkan allies, whose treatment of racial minorities has hitherto been conspicuously cruel and intolerant. It is idle to expect, moreover, that the Greeks, Serbs, and Rumanians will take the same enlightened view of their own interests as we are beginning to take of ours, for they are peoples who cherish their hatreds to the exclusion of self-interest, of common-sense, and of that sanity of feeling which is returning to Western Europe. Their policy towards Bulgaria is—and will long continue to be—the infliction of as much suffering as possible on the Bulgarian people, regardless of the common economic interests of the Balkan countries.

If the peace of Europe is to be made secure, the United States and Great Britain must take the initiative in revising, not only the Treaty of Versailles, but all the Peace Treaties drawn up at Paris during the past year.

London, February 9 LELAND BUXTON

The Final Authority

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Readjustment to a normal method of living after the intensive one of war is difficult. The present indicates deeper unrest. This war was fought for a spiritual cause—to free the world from war. But the heads of governments are the same as before the war; each is grabbing such spoils as it can: England, Persia; France, the near East; America—Mexico? This war is beginning to look like every other war. If the Conference in Europe had resulted in some decision which indicated the end of the old order, the psychology of the present unrest would be other than it is. Those who sacrificed to end war already see looming a greater world issue. Men who believed in the cause for which they fought find the world robbed of freedom; weak nations at the mercy of the strong; in this country freedom of thought, speech, assembly, and press denied.

But out of this war has sprung a new conception of freedom. It has been growing from month to month. In Russia men believe they are struggling to make life equally beautiful for all. They are striving to make brotherhood among men a reality, not as it is here and in Europe, but as it might be if all this stupid game of grab were to cease. All life may be ended by gas and poison and bomb. But we do not want to end life. We want to make life beautiful everywhere, for all peoples. What is this new desire for freedom at the heart of this world unrest? Is it not growth, a desire for greater responsibility? Is it not a desire for unity among men, among nations? Is it not the very spirit of Christianity?

We are dreaming of a world that will allow us to hold our spiritual belief above all else; a world that will not force us to fight and kill; that will not deny us the right to think and feel beyond the barrier of the nation.

We are disillusioned. We are thinking for ourselves now. This war has united men and women of all countries as never before. We have, through this unity, outgrown the national mind. We are now thinking internationally. When a man thinks internationally he lays aside his rifle. When the national consciousness is replaced by an international one, the idea of an army to destroy life becomes unthinkable. The human mind has outgrown the dictum of force as the final authority. It has reached the point where the final authority must be one's inner spiritual belief. Existing governments are organized and maintained by force. No wonder the world is seething with unrest.

New York, January 25 MARIE T. GARLAND

A Collection of Hieroglyphs

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Professor Sayce, the eminent and veteran Oxford philologist, writes me:

"I am entirely at one with you on the subject of fonetic or simplified spelling, and I wish we could reform our contradictory and systemless collection of hieroglyphs which takes the place of it. Quite apart from the loss of time and labor involved in learning it, it is the chief obstacle to English becoming what otherwise it would be likely to become, the universal language.

"I was spending a year during the war in Japan, and lecturing to the students in the Imperial University of Kyoto, and was there struck by this fact. Between English spelling and the use of the Chinese characters by the Japanese, which English and American residents regard as a mark of barbarism, there is little fundamental difference.

"But I am too old to fight the old battles any more; that must be left to younger men. . . . I am afraid we must not expect much from America. Mr. Roosevelt's death was a great loss."

I hope your "great country," as Mr. Gladstone said to Mr. Edison, will pleasingly disappoint the venerable and erudite professor, by following in the footsteps of Franklin, Webster, March, Whitney, Lounsbury, and others.

Hetton-le-Hole, England, January 15 HENRY DRUMMOND

Contributors to this Issue

LELAND REX ROBINSON represented the Near East Relief abroad in 1918 and 1919. Last summer he made investigations in the Russian Caucasus for the American Persian Relief Commission.

CHRISTIAN ANDERSON is the pseudonym of a Schleswiger at present a resident of the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

En Route—The New England Express

By MARIE EMILIE GILCHRIST

MY thoughts go whirling round the world,
The rain slants by in wind-blown flight
As with a rush we thunder by
Hushed valleys or some dreaming height.
Where is the life I left behind?
What consciousness will I partake
When once I leave the train and all
This humming thoughtful silence break?
Old homes I know not circle past,
And nameless cities—blurred with rain,
As soul-alone I muse, and taste
Infinity—upon the train.

Books

A Great State History

The Centennial History of Illinois. Volume Two. *The Frontier State,* 1818-1848. By Theodore Calvin Pease. Volume III: *The Era of the Civil War,* 1848-1870. By Arthur Charles Cole. *Springfield, Illinois:* The Illinois Centennial Commission.

THESE two volumes, with three others yet to be published, and a preliminary volume—"Illinois in 1818," by S. J. Buck—already issued, will form the most thorough State history of a comprehensive scope yet written. Isolated episodes in the record of various States have been studied more intensively, but never the whole course of a State's history. Such a work could have been made possible only by the union of the energies of the State University and State Historical Library and the generous financial support of the State Legislature. The whole of Illinois has been combed for newspapers; manuscript sources have been sought on every hand; documents have been photographed by thousands in Washington and abroad. So much material has been collected that the historians of Eastern States, where Time has had opportunity to swallow more than in the West, must be all envy..

Historians of Illinois possess the great advantage that in political and economic fields the record is of interest to everyone in the nation: Illinois is the home of Lincoln and of Chicago. The writers of the present work, however, have not allowed the temptation to emphasize matter of national interest to hurt its symmetry. Greater space is given to the coming of the railways to Illinois than to the election of 1860; the foundation of Chicago is treated only in a general chapter on the early settlement of the northern part of the State. The authors have reason to consider as their single proudest achievement the correction they have given to false views regarding the history of Illinois in its purely local or sectional aspect, and the minute detail in which they have substituted an accurate view. Political leaders in early Illinois all used the pen freely in historical work, and much that has been accepted in Illinois history as authoritative requires verification, alteration in detail, and above all, a modern, impartial treatment. The history of Illinois finances and internal improvements was in early decades unusually checkered and disastrous. Illinois State politics from 1818 to 1850 were complicated more than in most States by personal factions and by sectional differences. The State had to choose in the twenties between slavery or an anti-slavery policy, and although not even all the southern counties were in favor of slavery, feverish excitement lasted for some years before a decision was made. The rapidity of railway construction in Illinois was remarkable: the first railway was completed from Chicago to Elgin in 1850, and in the next decade a perfect network was finished, comprising a half dozen lines crossing the State from east to west and two from north to south. Illinois became in thirty years after its admission one of the leading farming States in the Union. All this, and much more, is told with great fulness in these two volumes.

Two striking episodes of general interest occur in the first of the volumes—the Black Hawk War and the Mormon War. The former is here envisaged as a tragic event, a poignant piece of injustice to the Indian. In 1820, the chief village and burying ground of the Sauk had for more than a century been at the junction of the Rock and the Mississippi Rivers. By the treaty of 1804, five chiefs of the Sauk and Foxes had signed away the whole of their great tract of land between the Illinois and the Mississippi, with the reservation that they might live and hunt upon this land so long as it was the property of the Government. Even as late as 1830, the body of whites in Illinois lay far to the east and south. Yet in 1823 squatters began to appear in the Rock Island region and to encroach upon the Indian corn-fields, in violation of Federal laws and the Indian treaty. After a half-dozen years of this, some of the squatters took out preëmption rights. To see the whites seizing their ancient corn-fields and plowing up their graves filled the Indians with indignation, and the aged Black Hawk in 1830 ordered the whites to remove. The result was the march of 600 volunteers and ten companies of regulars upon the weak tribe, which hastily retreated across the Mississippi; five days later they signed a treaty agreeing never to recross to the east. But they had left their growing crops on the other bank, and as it was too late to plant anew, that autumn they began to starve: Indian braves were fired upon when they tried to take roasting ears from the crops they had left on their old lands. The next spring the Sauk were invited by the Winnebago, who lived in northern Illinois, to come and raise a crop with them, and the guileless Black Hawk, seeing no wrong in this, crossed the Mississippi in full view of Fort Armstrong. His mission was quite harmless, but it filled northern Illinois with excitement—excitement to which thousands of men, spoiling for the diversion of a little Indian-killing, readily responded. Volunteers were soon marching again, and at their near approach the Sauk leaders prepared to retrace their steps to Iowa. All this might have been done bloodlessly, had not a flag of truce which Black Hawk sent out been fired upon by the irrepressible Illinoisans, and the "war" thus commenced. It was a war in which the white men showed want of discipline, panic, and disregard of not merely chivalry but humanity in their treatment of Indian women and children.

Dr. Pease's chapter on the Mormon War shows that the eviction of Joseph Smith's followers from Nauvoo, where they settled in 1839, grew out of an enmity to them primarily political. At first both Whigs and Democrats courted the Mormons. In 1842, Smith published through their official paper a declaration of their intention to vote that year for the Democratic ticket, and the result was that the Whig candidate for Governor assumed an anti-Mormon stand. Fear that the sect wished to control the State politically deepened as it was shown that it held the balance of power, and as immigration swelled its numbers; this fear was accentuated by the revelations of John C. Bennett, a Mormon turncoat, as to Smith's unscrupulousness. Nauvoo grew to 15,000 people, twice as many as in Chicago or Alton, and its leaders hoped to make it the metropolis of Illinois. The Mormons boasted of their industry, their fine brick houses, their stately public structures like the Temple and the Nauvoo House, and their nascent manufactories, and though the prosperity was of a showy, fragile sort, rival towns like Warsaw and Quincy had reason for jealousy. In 1844, the year in which Smith foolishly decided to announce himself for the American Presidency, the decisive outbreak occurred. The people of Illinois and a small area of Iowa and Missouri, hearing that an anti-Mormon press in Nauvoo had been destroyed, took the law into their own hands, lodged the Smith brothers in jail in Carthage, and allowed them to be murdered there.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln we meet in Mr. Pease's volume, in an account of the general indignation evoked by his "spot resolutions" in the Mexican War, which most Illinoisans disapproved—traitor being a word repeatedly applied to him. The Civil War dominates Mr. Cole's volume. The history of the Lincoln-Douglas senatorial contest is written for the first time from the newspaper sources, which give the fullest information upon it and its background of public sentiment. The not-always-remembered fact is emphasized that the joint debates were a comparatively unimportant part of the campaign, except as they gained national attention for the two men. Much of the real work of the campaign was done by the newspapers and by the subordinate orators. Mr. Cole brings out in strong relief the fact that the initial willingness of Eastern Republicans to support Douglas in his campaign for the Senatorship, and to advise Illinois Republicans not to put up a candidate of their own, furnished the real inception for Lincoln's "boom" for the Presidency. In the spring of 1858 all good Illinois Republicans believed Seward would be the party's candidate in 1860. The Republican delegates travelling to the State Convention had found by a straw vote that he was overwhelmingly the favorite. But when Douglas took an anti-Lecompton position in Kansas affairs, and thus split the Democratic party in Illinois and elsewhere, Greeley, Seward, and others were so pleased that they were eager to support Douglas in his fight with Buchanan, and in his incidental efforts to win the senatorship once more. Earnest Illinois leaders in the party regarded this as an equal compound of folly and of treachery to principle, and many of them then and there abandoned the Eastern leaders. On November 19, 1858, the Olney *Times* published "Abram Lincoln for President for 1860" at the head of its editorial page, and in that month or the next the Chicago *Democrat*, *Illinois State Journal* (Springfield), and Rockford *Republican* all spoke of Lincoln as possible Presidential timber.

On events and sentiment in Illinois during the Civil War Mr. Cole's volume presents a varied array of fresh and valuable material. Those who think of southern Illinois, with southern Indiana and Ohio, as the stronghold of Copperheadism, will be surprised to learn that its response to appeals for troops was the most satisfactory in the State. Even at the first call, the Cairo district ("Egypt") at the southern tip of Illinois offered more companies than could be received. Nevertheless, Copperheadism was far from unknown, and in strongly Democratic communities it became at times a positive menace. In the river counties of central and southern Illinois the more violent disloyalists were reinforced by men escaped from the army, by bushwhackers and desperadoes, and by Missourians of evil tendency, and they threw whole districts into panic by their murders and depredations. Draft rioting in 1863 occurred in scattered communities, and the little town of Olney was for three days besieged by a mob of a half-thousand men demanding the surrender of the enrolment lists. But the State, with its great agricultural prosperity, its ever-growing population, its strategic position, was one of the main pillars of the nation during the war. It furnished not only the Union's President and greatest general, but more than 250,000 men.

ALLAN NEVINS.

Militarism Rampant

Militarism in Education. By John Langdon-Davies. London: Headley Bros.

"WE like to regard the human intellect as the basis of civilization, and to leave instinct to the beasts; but we cannot. Man never trusts to his reason; though he has developed his brain to the degree of elephantiasis, and though the clear intellects of a few individuals may guide the course of human politics, the mass mind, which in the long run settles the trend of social evolution, rests for motive on instinct, blind as an insect's, emotional, irrational, often hysterical." In these words, with which Mr. Langdon-Davies begins his little book on militarism in education, we have at once the root reason of the danger of all militarist tendencies and the clue to their amendment. For, as he truly says, education "is far more than the training of the intellect and memory to grasp facts. It is also the training of the emotions to react to special ideals. . . . Bring a child up to cherish a given ideal, and that ideal will always remain the basis of its thought and action; repeat the process throughout a whole nation by means of its schools, and that ideal will determine the national history for years."

The realization of this fact by Germany, and the utilization of it for the glorification of the State, developed what we came to know as Prussianism. It is the purpose of this book to show how certain factions in England are endeavoring by the introduction of military training into the schools "to turn England into a military state modelled on Prussia." This endeavor is of course justified with all the familiar arguments as to the dangers of unpreparedness, the evils of physical degeneration, the necessity of collective discipline, and the need of inculcating patriotism—arguments often heard in the United States, where similar schemes are now on foot.

Mr. Langdon-Davies enumerates, as those desirous of perpetuating the Prussian ideal, the military enthusiasts who are seeking raw material for new armies, the class of capitalists who for purposes of industrial efficiency desire "hands" rather than men, and who look to the stultifying effects of such a system as a corrective to unrest and a protection from class war, and, worst of all, "the educationists themselves, who have been thrown off their balance by the war." These would all "teach patriotism, meaning thereby exaltation of naval, military, and commercial supremacy"; they would "teach collective discipline, meaning thereby to make the workers machine-like and docile"; they would "stunt our children's bodies with military drill, with its ill effects on muscle and mind"; and they would "garble history, forbid free-thought to teachers, inculcate State worship, solidify international hatred, and turn the rising generation into a conscript army of half-grown boys."

It must not be thought that Mr. Langdon-Davies decries discipline. He merely deplores the "confusion of external discipline with self-control and of regimentation with corporate spirit." Whereas military training is necessarily arbitrary and autocratic, "those who treat education with wisdom and sanity are coming more and more to believe in educational self-government, in relaxation of imposed discipline." These two tendencies are exemplified in the Cadet movement and that of the Boy Scouts, the former tending to produce "a nation of machines in the hands of a few aristocratic traction-engine drivers," while the latter aims at developing resourcefulness and initiative, its central principle being that the boy should be encouraged to educate himself instead of being instructed. Although it has not escaped the inevitable taint of militarism during the war, Mr. Langdon-Davies considers that at its best and so long as it retains its voluntary character, scouting may be an effective means of combating militarism, by reason of its democratic constitution and the fraternizing possibilities between Scouts in all countries, for "a Scout is a brother to a Scout wherever he is, in whatever land."

From the point of view of physical health, Mr. Langdon-Davies gives many proofs from experienced educationists of the deleterious effects on children of military training. "Military drill is bad physically, because it aims at stiffness and unnatural muscular reactions, because it exercises the muscles of the two sides of the body unequally, producing malformations of growth, and because it relies on restraint and not on healthy enjoyment." Countries such as Australia have found juvenile conscription unsatisfactory in physical results and inferior to games and organized athletic sports as training for growing boys. In a valuable chapter on The Psychological Aims of Physical Education, Mr. Langdon-Davies points out that character must be built on the basis of instinct and that "the cornerstone of the superstructure is the acquirement of habit and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self-control. The former cannot owe anything to collective discipline, for to be valuable a habit must be the result of the will-power of the individual and not the imposition of outward command; this is because a simple habit is much less valuable than the 'habit of forming habits' which needs will-power for its formation. The latter again is only useful when it is the result not of mechanical repetition, but of conscious volition."

As for the deliberate teaching of patriotism, Mr. Langdon-Davies demonstrates that where a child's instincts are trained aright and along healthy lines, the gregariousness inherent in the human race will instinctively induce a natural love of country founded on the appreciation of what is best in it and fully adequate without outward stimulus. "The patriotism may not," he says, "be of the exact brand most dear to the militarist, and the conscious insistence on it which forms part of so many people's program of education makes one suspicious that what they want is not natural patriotism but love and respect for their armaments and their commercial enterprises." This same herd instinct, in so far as it leads men to rely on the general trend of thought and belief, can of course be made a natural ally of the militarists, and they are not neglectful of it. "In a mild form this is conservatism, in a strong form reactionary prejudice. It must be the aim of character formation to train the child to rely on itself and not on others, on personal experience and not the common beliefs of his surroundings."

It is clear that the war to end war must be waged by the schoolmaster rather than by the soldier. But to do this, teachers must have freedom of religious and political ideals; "liberty," says Mr. Langdon-Davies, "necessitates that truth should be uncensored, and it is a sign of a corrupt government to tamper with the full portrayal of every side of controversial questions, whether to children or to adults. It is a sign of the decline of our liberties [he is writing of England], as a result of the war, that not only do we deny the right of teachers to teach their idea of the truth, but we have fallen so low as to penalize them for refusing to teach what they believe wrong."

B. U. Burke

How the War Was Won

The Last Four Months: How the War Was Won. By Major-General Sir F. Maurice. Little, Brown and Company.

ON July 18, 1918, General Ludendorff's last great attack broke down and General Foch in his turn took the offensive. Four months later came the armistice, and the Allies had won the war. In his account of the military operations of these four months General Maurice traces the victorious progress of the Allied forces in its larger aspects and tries to indicate and evaluate the principal factors that produced the final result. Being a confirmed "Westerner," the author quite naturally limits his discussion to the movements on the western front; the breakdown of Bulgarian resistance and its consequent results are given incidental mention only. General Maurice finds it necessary, however, to discuss certain events and conditions that preceded the movement toward the Rhine; he gives a brief account of the situation earlier in the year, of the great German offensives from March to July, and of the events that led to the appointment of Foch as generalissimo. In this connection he gives a fairly exhaustive discussion of the military theories and methods of General Foch, and attempts to trace the outlines of the strategic plan that was followed in the last phase of the war. The work is in a sense, therefore, an account of the entire campaign of 1918 on the western front with the emphasis on the events of the later months. The war was won, General Maurice believes, not by any particular force or army, but by united action under General Foch. But though he refuses to grant that the American Expeditionary Force was the deciding factor, he describes quite fully the part played by General Pershing's men and finds repeated occasion to pay generous tribute to the valor and efficiency of the American forces.

On a number of disputed points the author expresses opinions which if not final are at least extremely suggestive. The success of the German offensives earlier in the year he attributes to the failure of the Allies to make adequate preparation to meet a danger which they knew would soon be upon them. It seems that Lloyd George refused to take the situation seriously; he believed that neither army would be able to make much headway against the other, and consequently saw no urgent reason for strengthening the Allied lines. In September when General Foch decided to give the Germans "the knock-out blow," the English Government was again in error: Lloyd George and his advisers doubted the expediency of an attack at that time and counselled delay till the following spring. That Foch decided to ignore the warnings from London was largely due to the advice of General Pershing, who favored an early advance. The author admits that the American army was not very well prepared for such a movement as was contemplated, and that the casualties in the Argonne were more numerous than they might have been if the Americans had had more experience with the enemy's methods of warfare; nevertheless he regards General Pershing's decision as wise, since a delay of offensive operations till the spring of 1919 would probably have meant an even greater loss of life. General Maurice is also sure that the armistice was not concluded at too early a date. A continuation of the offensive might have terminated in disaster, as the transport system was scarcely adequate to supply the vast advancing forces with food and munitions. Furthermore, the German army was beaten and realized that it was beaten; there was, therefore, no good reason for continuing the fighting after the enemy had asked for an armistice.

Laurence M. Larson.

A Perplexed Conservative

Tradition and Change. By Arthur Waugh. E. P. Dutton and Company.

CRITICS of conservative taste, rather promiscuously dubbed Victorian by the more radical, are now pretty generally and consciously on the defensive. Some resort, as Professor Sherman does in his brilliant volume "On Contemporary Literature," to a vigorous counter-offensive; and this is certainly the best strategy. Others, older and hence more sensitive to the charge of being out of date, assume an apologetic manner; they know they are "Victorian," but they can't help it, and they conscientiously try to like as many of the innovations of the youngsters as they can. Such is the attitude of Mr. Arthur Waugh in "Tradition and Change." Describing evidently his own feelings, he says in the title essay: "He desires vehemently, it may be, to keep pace with 'the great mundane movement' . . . but he is only too pitiably conscious of the fact that, however much he strives to deceive himself, there is a great deal which the young men proclaim as beautiful that seems to him intolerably ugly." After further confession of limitations, he asks his readers to believe that the book "represents an honest effort to recognize the value of as much of the new spirit as seems reasonably consonant with old standards: the effort of one who would gladly be young again, if he could." He sees clearly that "the most insidious perils of today are the perils of violence and crudity, of a passion for originality at any cost, of eccentricity in form and of vulgarity in matter"; but he hesitates to believe his eyes fully, because they are getting middle-aged. His taste is sensitive and discriminating; what he lacks as a critic is the acumen to perceive the philosophical justification for his taste. There is thus a sort of wistfulness, amounting almost to pathos, in his attitude. He is eager to convince his younger readers that among the Victorians too there were rebels and innovators; and so he gives special praise to Swinburne, and Henry James, and Samuel Butler. Swinburne, indeed, he praises without much discrimination, because he feels that one who was at once an arch-rebel and a great master of form is especially

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

qualified to teach the young rebels the lesson that he believes they most need—that "without Form there can be no true literature, without Beauty the art of the poet languishes and falls to dust." He is inclined also to overestimate somewhat the work of younger men who seem to him to have carried on the tradition of reverence for form and beauty—Lionel Johnson, Arthur Symons, James Elroy Flecker; yet he praises these men persuasively and well. His criticism indeed is always thoughtful, and if allowance be made for the tendencies just noted, generally sound. Particularly suggestive are the essays on War Poetry, 1914-1918, and The New Realism, which are closely related in thought. Mr. Waugh finds the distinguishing trait of the poetry of the World War in its realism—its square and honest facing of fact, however brutal and squalid. This he traces partly to the time-spirit and partly to the fact that "the best new poetry of war is written, not by lookers-on, but by the soldiers themselves." He notes three stages in the soldier-poet's reaction to war: first the introspective and almost purely personal stage, represented for instance by Rupert Brooke; then the overwhelming sense of the huge mechanism of war, to which the individual is a hopeless slave; finally a new spirit of democracy and brotherhood in suffering, combined with scorn of the sentimental and romantic drapery with which poetry has generally decorated war. As this essay suggests, Mr. Waugh heartily welcomes the new realism, in the belief that on the whole it makes for a more sincere and honest attitude toward life and its values. "The New Realism, after all," he concludes, "is only the old Idealism seen from the other side." This is perhaps debatable; but it is typical of the author's earnest attempt to orient himself in the new time. One wishes that he would not concede and apologize quite so much; yet these concessions and apologies spring from a spirit chivalrous, genuinely humble, and ardently seeking the truth.

HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE

A Brazilian Novel

Canaan. By Graça Aranha of the Brazilian Academy. Translated from the Portuguese by Mariano Joaquin Lorente. With a Preface by Guglielmo Ferrero. The Four Seas Company.

THE exotic still dazzles even the greatest wits. Otherwise Anatole France could never have called "Canaan" "the great American novel." For as a piece of writing, due allowance being made for a wretched translation, the book is amorphous in a curiously old-fashioned way. In spirit and structure it goes back to the first generation of the romantic writers. It smacks of Chateaubriand and of the romantic novelettes of the Germans; it is filled with futile and high-flown discussions. And these are at times set forth in the semi-dramatic fashion affected by the romantics as early as Crèvecœur's "Letters of an American Farmer" and also as late as Théophile Gautier's "Mlle. de Maupin."

The theme and fable of the book are scarcely less early-romantic in character than its style and structure. Milkau, a young German idealist, the son of a university professor, has wearied of the cruelty and corruption of Europe—quite as the men of the late eighteenth century did or thought they did—and sets out to find

> In happy climes the seat of innocence
> Where Nature guides and virtue rules.

He does not desire to stay in the commercial colonies of his countrymen in Brazil, but with his somewhat harder headed friend Lentz settles in the virgin forest. A modern note steals into the narrative with the gradual disillusionment of Milkau. He finds himself soon enough in a situation which is anything but primitive and idyllic. On the one hand he sees the decay of the older Brazilian civilization and on the other a new and harsh and quite European struggle for the possession of the resources of the country. The ugly moral passions and prejudices of Europe are also projected into the book through the episode of Mary Perutz, which is horrible in a semi-romantic, semi-naturalistic way. But the end of the story is quite true to form. Milkau rescues Mary and wanders with her into the mountains, consoling himself with a long series of vague and melancholy and, in the original no doubt, sonorous reflections. We are given no hint as to any practical adjustment between the disillusioned man and his world.

What gives its value to the book and what, of course, aroused the warm interest of Professor Guglielmo Ferrero, is the picture which, largely by means of discussion, Aranha presents of the Brazilian civilization of today. How correct that picture is a complete outsider cannot presume to say. But the author's profoundly and helplessly romantic temperament should be taken into account. His strongest feeling is one of a vast dreariness in the present fate of his country. The native Portuguese are, from his description, a race in which the will itself is undergoing a process of decay. Their lands go to ruin, their administration of justice is a self-confessed farce. They make faces at the conquering European, but are forced into subservience to him by their own weakness. Business and enterprise are in the hands of the German colonists; customs and revenues are mortgaged to the English. The state is in a condition between "decrepitude and childishness." And thus, Aranha exclaims, "this poor Brazil is but a corpse which is rapidly decaying. . . . The *urubus* [vultures] are coming." That point of view is again, of course, vaguely romantic. Brazil is neither a conquered country nor a "sphere of influence." It is vast and rich and almost empty. Other portions of the world are crowded. Hence men of various nations drift thither and a biological conflict takes place among races of different degrees of vitality and intelligence. The tragic element in this situation is very clear and sharp. One feels it most keenly in Aranha's just regret over the passing of the folk-ways and folk-songs of his people. His remedy and hope, however, seem fantastic enough. The great conquering and triumphant races, he reasons, are all mixed races. Hence he expects nothing more of the Portuguese. The future of the country is in the hands of the mulattoes. They prove the best governors; Brazil belongs to them; the foreigner will be resisted "as long as there is a mulatto left." But Aranha does not succeed in communicating to the reader a very strong sense of this hope which he nourishes. Joca, the mulatto who dances his folk-dance and sings his Portuguese folk-song as a protest against the influence of the strangers, is a picturesque and pathetic figure. But he has neither energy nor mind. Yet he symbolizes the theme and intention of the book on its best side. Its weaker side is illustrated by the absurdly unreal description of the foreigners' behavior on the same occasion. Aranha's protest is poetic and appealing. But in its intellectual character it is futile, since his romanticism has not even permitted him to grasp the nature of the forces which he would assault.

A French View of Poe

La Vie d'Edgar A. Poe. By André Fontainas. Paris: Mercure de France.

THE chief aim which M. Fontainas keeps before himself in his life of Poe is to defend the poet against those who have misjudged and maligned him. This task he performs with fine earnestness and enthusiasm. That Poe was not without personal limitations, he admits; but he maintains that he was at heart a man of noble impulses and exalted ideals. "De l'honneur, de la probité," he asserts at one point, indeed, "il avait l'idée la plus étroite, la plus nette, la plus sensible et la plus pure." Accordingly, he acquits Poe of the charges of dishonesty and double-dealing that have been brought against him at various times. He finds little to complain of in his conduct during his unhappy final years. He absolves him from any guilt in connection with his compilation of his treatise on conchology. He is disposed to forgive him for his multifarious yarns about an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alleged voyage to Europe in 1827. He declines to accept the theory that he was at some time addicted to the use of opium. He rejects by implication, if not explicitly, the theory now generally accepted in America as to the immediate cause of Poe's death. And he rejects outright Griswold's charges of ingratitude and arrogance, characterizing Griswold, as Baudelaire had done, as a monster among biographers.

That M. Fontainas, in his enthusiasm, overshoots the mark somewhat in his defence of the poet will scarcely be denied. He is quite right in holding that Poe was by no means so bad a man as Griswold and other early biographers tried to make him out. And he is obviously correct in insisting that Poe's character must not be judged apart from his writings: in his emphasis on this point is to be found one of the chief merits and the chief distinction of this book. But after all is said that may be said in explanation and extenuation of the poet's shortcomings, it would seem difficult to condone all the excesses of his closing years. It is impossible to forget his assaults upon Longfellow. It is not plain that his conduct was above reproach in the matter of his use of Captain Brown's "Conchology." And shall we dismiss his much fibbing about himself as mere innocent "mystification"?

Aside from his overstatement of the case for Poe, M. Fontainas falls into a number of minor inaccuracies. It was not in 1816, for instance, but in 1815, that the youthful Poe left America with the Allans for his trip to England; and it was not in 1821, but in 1820, that he returned to America. It was not in January, but in March, 1827, that Poe ran away from the Allan home in Richmond. It was not in 1842, but in 1844, that he left Philadelphia to make his home in New York. It is not quite accurate to say that contemporary American magazines were silent as to Poe's "Poems" of 1831: there were notices in both the New York *Mirror* and the Philadelphia *Casket*. And there is no evidence that Poe and Mrs. Osgood carried on a correspondence after their rupture in 1846. In certain other particulars M. Fontainas has not availed himself of the results of recently published investigations in his field. Thus he takes no account of the revelations made by Professor J. C. French in 1917 as to Poe's activities in Baltimore in 1833, nor of various bits of new information brought out somewhat earlier as to his life in Baltimore in 1831 and 1832 and as to his life as a boy in Richmond and London. But these omissions are explained in the preface as arising from the fact that the manuscript for the volume was ready for the press—indeed, passed into the hands of the printers—in May, 1914, publication being deferred only because of the war. It should be added that M. Fontainas makes no attempt to throw light on the obscure places in Poe's history, but contents himself with weighing and interpreting the evidence as brought out by other biographers.

KILLIS CAMPBELL

Books in Brief

SEVERAL smaller volumes have already been published by Dr. Grenfell, giving some account of his work among the Labrador fishermen, but in "A Labrador Doctor, An Open-Air Autobiography" (Houghton Mifflin) the full story of his life and achievements is told for the first time. In one of those unconscious jokes sometimes perpetrated by errant type the publisher's announcement card names it "A Laboratory Doctor." Dr. Grenfell's daring and adventurous life, including thirty-two years spent with deep-sea fishermen, certainly has had little in common with that of the other kind of scientist who spends his days and nights with a microscope. This great medical missionary tells with straightforward simplicity his boyish escapades, weaving vivid threads of adventure and accomplishment into a very human background. Born on the English sea-coast, he tasted with his first breath the salt air and love of the sea. He and his brothers often slipped away as children to spend the day and night with fishermen in their boats. He describes his years in a preparatory school, his decision to study medicine, and his hospital experience. Under the influence of Dwight L. Moody young Grenfell decided to become a missionary, though distressed to find "that the mere word 'missionary' aroused suspicion," and that people thought missionaries "unpractical if not hypocritical and mildly incompetent if not really vicious." Asked to cross the Atlantic in a small sailing vessel to investigate opportunities for service among the fishermen of the northwest Atlantic, he arrived on the Labrador coast on August 4, 1892. "The exhilarating memory of that day is one which will die only when we do. A glorious sun shone over an oily ocean of cerulean blue, over a hundred towering icebergs of every fantastic shape, and flashing all of the colors of the rainbow from their gleaming pinnacles as they rolled on the long and lazy swell. Birds familiar and strange left the dense shoals of rippling fish, over which the great flocks were hovering and quarrelling in noisy enjoyment, to wave us welcome as they swept in joyous circles overhead." The medical work among the neglected people of that land which began almost as soon as Dr. Grenfell's party landed has continued ever since. "Among the Eskimos I found a great deal of tuberculosis and much eye trouble. Nearly all had been taught to read and write in Eskimo, though there is no literature in that language to read, except such books as have been translated by the Moravian Brethren. At that time a strict policy of teaching no English had been adopted. In one of my lectures, on returning to England, I mentioned that as the Eskimos had never seen a lamb or a sheep either alive or in a picture, the Moravians, in order to offer them an intelligible and appealing simile, had most wisely substituted the kotik, or white seal, for the phrase 'the Lamb of God.' One old lady in my audience must have felt that the good Brethren were tampering unjustifiably with Holy Writ, for the following summer, from the barrels of clothing sent out to the Labrador, was extracted a dirty, distorted, and much-mangled and wholly sorry-looking woolly toy lamb. Its *raison d'être* was a mystery until we read the legend carefully pinned to one dislocated leg, 'Sent in order that the heathen may know better.'" Schools, hospitals, libraries, coöperative stores, machine shops, a saw-mill, a fox farm, and a children's home have been established. Dr. Grenfell and his associates have now a plan under consideration to dam the Straits of Belle Isle, thereby making the Gulf of St. Lawrence free from ice and open to navigation all winter, and also making the climate of Nova Scotia warmer.

MR. HERBERT ELLSWORTH CORY'S "The Intellectuals and the Wage Workers" (Sunwise Turn) is an attempt to present the terms upon which intellectuals and wage workers should unite in the task of social reconstruction. But Mr. Cory sees modern society, the labor movement, and the purpose of revolution in psychoanalytic terms. He states his purpose thus: "I have been trying to make some forecast of the processes by which intellectuals and wage workers will unite to break down rationally those institutions which are but hysterical symptoms, compromises, bad habit-formations from competitive random activities, morbid complexes and inertia." This quotation may suggest, however indefinitely, the abstruse manner in which Mr. Cory has chosen to present his thesis. His apparently easy references to the most diverse contributors in half a dozen fields of human knowledge, philosophy, psychology, education, the labor movement, economics, the physical sciences, are amazing. Yet a full integration seems to be lacking. It is evident that he has written for scholars rather than for students. The members of the proletariat, to whom, it is evident, he dedicates his volume, will be least likely to grasp Mr. Cory's message because it is so heavily weighted with scientific terms. Neither the radical proletariat (members of the American Federation of Labor seem to be tacitly excluded, in Mr. Cory's view, in that they lack class-consciousness) nor the intel-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lectuals to whom he appeals for leadership will be moved. The former, with a distrust of the intellectual that not even Mr. Cory is proof against, will not be able to understand him; and the latter are not sufficiently emancipated from their bourgeois habits of thought and feeling to accept leadership in the mission he suggests. Rarely has there appeared so erudite and so intensely radical a teacher. Probably Mr. Cory will fulfil himself not as a leader or teacher of the proletariat, but as a leader and teacher of other intellectuals whose minds are nearer to the level of the minds of the proletarians.

A BOOK written in France by a French scholar, finished in the last year of the war, touching upon some of the acutest problems of the struggle and yet completely free from hatred and political bias—all this can be said, and more, of Professor A. Meillet's "Les langues dans l'Europe nouvelle" (Paris: Payot). One's surprise at the discovery measures the war-time degradation of international culture. The book is a model textbook in every sense, very readable and non-technical, and yet distinctly above the level of the mere popular treatise. Starting from linguistic geography in the stricter sense, the grouping, origins, and correlation of languages, the author proceeds to an analysis of the relation of language and race, language and nationality, language and civilization, then to the tendencies in language development, extension, differentiation and integration, evolution of literary and scientific languages, and linguistic decay. His attitude to Latin is, as can be expected, highly sympathetic, but not blindly partisan; his assertion that not only a Frenchman and Italian, but an Englishman and even a German cannot penetrate to the spirit of his own language without some knowledge of Latin, can hardly be disputed. M. Meillet believes in the possibility of developing an international auxiliary idiom like Esperanto, or rather Ido, based on the "partly Hellenized Latin" which is the linguistic understructure of European civilization, and suggests that such an eclectic tongue might furnish an excellent approach to things European for the Japanese and Chinese. He is right in recognizing the anti-cultural implications of linguistic jingoism, such as is seen in the case of the Norwegian "landsmaal" movement or the puristic frenzy of Czech scholars, who eliminated universally used terms of Graeco-Latin origin chiefly because the Germans also employed them. M. Meillet repudiates the racial theory of nationality and language, and by tracing linguistic struggles to their economic roots puts the whole army of mystic nationalists to rout.

"ON Society" (Macmillan), by Frederic Harrison, is a clear and cogent exposition of Positivist ideas and ideals. Perhaps its greatest value for the reader of today is the proof it offers of the possibility of upholding liberal, and even radical, social and political ideas without succumbing to socialistic and communistic theories. The ideal of competition in industry Mr. Harrison calls a cynical and blighting sophism. Selfishness, he says, lies at the root of our industrial evils. But as he sees it, Socialism would inoculate all men with the same selfish poison. Positivism, on the other hand, teaches the doctrine of the true Republic, or government in the name and for the benefit of society as a permanent and organic whole. Starting from the dogma of Comte, *Vivre pour autrui*, here paraphrased Life belongs to Humanity, Mr. Harrison proceeds to develop the ethics of humanity. He expounds the conception of the family as the ultimate unit of society and examines the nature and limitations of governmental authority. The Positivist limits the duties of the State to the maintenance of order, the provision for public health, the promotion of industry, and the supply of a simple and scientific system of law. Education, like all moral and religious training, is, he holds, a matter wholly outside of the true sphere of governmental activity. The Positivist Utopia that he describes in the sixth lecture embraces many of the ideals of modern socialism, but the means by which he would attempt to realize this dream are not legislation, confiscation, and class warfare; but what he holds to be the only true religion, the religion of humanity. That humanity is to be saved by the worship of humanity appears to savor somewhat of paradox.

TO an unusual degree Mr. Caleb Guyer Kelly's "French Protestantism, 1559-1562" (Johns Hopkins Press) exemplifies the virtues and vices commonly associated with the doctor's thesis. Wishing to offer a *specimen eruditionis* that should exhibit his command of the facts in the most favorable light, the author has accumulated a vast store of data from a large number of books and has spread them lavishly upon the page of a monograph. But the little white slips on which he took his notes have snowed him under. From all sorts of books, good, bad, and indifferent, he has drawn statements without sifting or questioning their value. For one important assertion he relies on an historical romance of Prosper Mérimée; vast as is his reading he does not know some of the best authorities on the subject—in fact, when he cites but two of the ten volumes of letters by Catherine de' Medici he apparently omits the most important source of all for his period. He repeats the same fact or anecdote now drawn from one authority, now from another. Contradictions are frequent, as when he reckons the value of sixteenth-century money in one place as one-third and in another as one-fifteenth of what it is now. Neither the one calculation nor the other is his own; the contradiction is due to the fact that he had different authors before him when he copied from his notes. He prints names in different forms; occasionally he finds a simple French word untranslatable as when he classes "grenouilles" as a kind of fish. A considerable amount of useful material has been hurt by Mr. Kelly's failure to discern good authorities from bad ones and to reflect a little on his own conclusions.

THE reader who picks up Euphemia Macleod's "Seances with Carlyle" (Four Seas) will be either disappointed or delighted to find that the communications of the Scotch philosopher are avowedly imaginary. The guarantee that the introduction of a spirit is a mere literary artifice is not only the merciful parsimony in the use of "psychic" jargon, but the fact that the dead man for once talks something a little better than platitude. The most important truths that have as yet reached us from the beyond have revealed where the speaker's aunt mislaid her curling tongs, or the color of a friend's pajamas; whereas in this book Carlyle speaks, though in a somewhat oracular and flowery style, of the moral bearings of the universe. Having shed his earlier prejudices in favor of Germany and of the strong man, he now informs us that "a great nation has the mark of Cain on its brow," and that there is a good bit of difference between the German and the American eagle. He has his doubts about the latter until it "spreads its wings and shrieks defiance at the malefactor," but he later compliments "the royal-hearted people, led by a right royal eagle, and fashioned after its noblest pattern, a people generous and unafraid . . . who mount into the star-bespread blue in white purity of intention, barred with the blood-red stripes of their slain." If symbolism is the rage let us clash the cymbals loudly!

IF anyone wishes to read "a spiritual interpretation of the war" compounded of boasting of our own material and moral superiority and reviling of the fallen foe, he can be safely recommended to peruse Mr. Horatio W. Dresser's "On the Threshold of the Spiritual World" (Sully). Written without magnanimity, without discipline of thought or standards of style, it is concocted altogether of good intentions enough to pave a large block of a certain celebrated highway, and of that sort of sentimentality known, because of its excessive insipidity, as "mush." The child who said "salt is what makes things taste bad when it isn't in them" gave unconsciously a definition of culture as well. There is no more brilliant illustration of the epigram than that furnished by the present work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes and News

Houghton Mifflin Company announces for the early spring a study, by Mr. James I. Osborne, of Arthur Hugh Clough. This poet for nearly fifty years has in some way or other eluded biographers, though he had a decent fame in his own day and seems now better than almost any other minor writer to indicate the winds of doctrine which then prevailed.

The same house will shortly publish Miss Myra Reynolds's "The Learned Lady in England 1650-1760," a chapter in the history of civilization which reminds us of Hawthorne's sly remark about those village poetesses whose tragic fate it was to wear blue stockings which no one ever looked at.

Is Henry van Dyke a classic? His "Poems of Tennyson" and his "Studies in Tennyson" (formerly "The Poetry of Tennyson") are being reissued by the Scribners in editions as dainty as Tennyson himself at his daintiest. And the first two volumes of The Works of Henry van Dyke, Avalon Edition, have gone to join the royal rows of Scribner's Library of Modern Authors. The two are "Little Rivers" and "Fisherman's Luck," natural propædeutics for Americans who will later read "The Compleat Angler."

We guiterman a volume when,
Though but one pen can rightly do it,
We view it reasonably, then
With ripe and rippling rhymes review it.

(How delicate *should* be the eye,
How deft and definite the hand
Of the audacious poet by
Whom Guiterman is guitermanned!)

This Arthur with the nib of gold,
The quaintest of the critic carpers
Who sang *New* York, has sung the Old
Manhattan now in ballads (Harpers).

The color of his music moves
From Dobson's to our Yankee Doodle's;
Assay his mixture, and it proves,
However, Guiterman in oodles.

He sings the founders: "Kips, Van Dorns,
Van Dams, Van Wycks, Van Dycks, Van Pelts,
Van Tienhovens, Schermerhorns,
And Onderdoncks and Roosevelts."

Of Tappan Zee, of Nepperhan,
Of Hellegatt, of Spuyten Duyvil,
Of 't Maagde Paetje, Guiterman
Here rhymes in rings around each rival.

Adieu vers libre, adieu the news,
Adieu the horrid shilling-shocker;
We hail the marriage of the Muse
To Mynheer Diedrich Knickerbocker.

The Yale University Press has already published in the Yale Series of Younger Poets, meant to encourage poets not yet recognized, Mr. Howard Buck's "The Tempering" and Mr. John C. Farrar's "Forgotten Shrines."

Mr. Ole Hanson's "Americanism versus Bolshevism," published by Doubleday, Page, has at last appeared and has begun its work. Mr. Hanson is the authentic, rough-hewn Calvin Coolidge of the Northwest.

Drama

Brieux and Barrymore

NO misgivings have ever clouded the bright and busy career of Eugène Brieux. He has avoided extremes and ultimates and applied himself to the correction of social details. The formula of the didactic play, which he has cultivated, is as completely exemplified in his first play as in his last. You show a defect in the social machinery, exhibit its consequences, proclaim its remedy. The technical weakness inseparable from this formula is clear at once. At a certain point in the play its dramatic energy dwindles and discussion sets in. Thus in "Le Berceau," for instance, Brieux presents one of the most poignant situations in the world and then forces the participants to engage in declamatory theorizing throughout the better part of two acts. For he insists in his own fashion, which is, of course, not the vulgar one, on a happy ending. He is an undeterred meliorist. There is no mystery at the heart of things, no contradictions that common sense and honesty cannot resolve. Everything can be improved, and it is the function of the didactic dramatist to point the way.

Such drama can never, it is plain enough, be tragic. The tragic problem begins where Brieux stops. Since he desires to instruct, he starts with definite and fixed assumptions. He never questions the established values, but strives merely to show how they fail of a right and full expression through the existing social machinery. He does not permit his mind to penetrate to the naked idea at all. Thus in "The Letter of the Law" (La robe rouge) he assumes that the judging of men by men and the infliction of punitive justice are both right and possible. He wants a more flexible legal machinery and officials of a more sensitive conscience. Well, so does everybody. Hence nothing has ever stood in the way of Brieux' fame, which is wider than that of men of twice his depth and talent. His works make for purer family life, cleaner politics, better citizenship. But he asks no troublesome questions, he disturbs no one's psychical comfort. The accused man in "The Letter of the Law" turns out to have been innocent. You must not convict on circumstantial evidence; you must not be eager to convict for the sake of official glory. Who could withhold his assent from sentiments so respectable?

Compare with this a tragic drama on the same theme—John Galsworthy's "Justice." Falder is guilty. Given the present social compacts his guilt is grave. Yet justice miscarries. But it does so not through its accidental defects but through its essential nature. The justice of man judging man cannot be just. The ultimate dilemma stands revealed in its bare, immitigable tragedy. Had Etshpare been guilty Brieux would have sent him to penal servitude with unction or, had he perjured himself in his confusion and despair, to the solitary confinement with which Mouzon threatens him. Galsworthy lays bare the inhumanity of solitary confinement for any cause and under any circumstances. He asks final questions and rediscovers eternal words: Judge not that ye be not judged. Brieux is an upholder of law and order. He wants just law and good order according to his fixed notions of both. But so do the scribes and Pharisees.

Having defined the limitations of Brieux' talent, which are identical with those of his mind, it is but just to dwell briefly on his one strong and permanent gift. The characters in terms of which he states his problem in each play are wholly and sturdily human. As a creator of character he has not only power but range. He knows the peasantry of the North and the South of France, the laborers, the middle classes, the government officials. His people necessarily share his own limitations. When he sought to portray artists he produced caricatures. There is no human being with a vision in all his plays. For even Vagret in "The Letter of the Law" is no proclaimer of a new value, but merely an honest man. Hence it is natural that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brieux' best and by far most memorable play, "Les Hannetons," is the only one in which he abandons his didactic intentions and spends his energy on the creation of a few characters whom he thoroughly understands.

No better example of his art could have been selected for presentation than "La robe rouge." It shows him, as every artist should be shown, quite at his best. The dramatic life of the piece is indeed spent at the end of the second act. But that, as we have seen, is inherent in his method. The remaining acts do not at least consist of mere declamation. "La robe rouge" ends with an action. But it is amusingly characteristic of Brieux that the poor, passionate, maddened peasant woman is not permitted to stab the examining magistrate without first didactically explaining the moral of the play: "Yes! Now look at your work, all you wicked judges! Of an innocent man you almost make a criminal, and of an honest woman, of a mother, you have made a murderess!" That bit of verbiage is deftly suppressed at the Criterion Theatre, and the play is made to end with an incisive if unlikely ironic speech not found in the text.

The production of the play has intelligence and energy if not perfection. The women, especially in the first act, indulge in a few of the gestures and attitudes by which emotions are "registered" for the screen. The men, even to the janitor of the court house, play with realistic exactness. Miss Doris Rankin is not a great actress. With that fact she has been unjustly reproached. As the Basque peasant woman she has a wild and sultry passion held properly in leash even at its highest moments and uses her remarkable rather than beautiful voice not without impressiveness. Finally, there is Mr. Lionel Barrymore, who is the star of the production without taking advantage of any of the inartistic advantages of his position. He plays his part: that is all. And he plays it with superb vigor, gusto, and lifelikeness. His Mouzon is steely selfishness and ruthless sensuality to the core. But he has not the faintest suspicion of his own moral quality. He thinks he is a thoroughly good fellow. Hence his pleasant ways and debonair graces are perfectly spontaneous. He did not make the world and he lays claim to no sainthood. He takes things as he finds them, does his prescribed duty, and makes a good job of his career. His senses are his stumbling block and land him in an ugly scrape. But everybody was young once, and anyhow, men being what they are, what will you have? It is a characterization that one will not easily forget.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Art

In the Pennsylvania Academy

TO the fact of Alden Weir's recent death is probably due the prominence given, at the Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, to his painting The Sisters, lent by Mrs. Marshall Field. It hangs in the place of honor in the Central Gallery, and in its serenity has a curious air of detachment from the surrounding cleverness. It is well known; it needs no description. It may not have the strength of some of Weir's other portraits. Indeed, its refinement is almost exaggerated; the two sisters, with their pale faces and white gowns, seem to fade into ghosts of themselves; the detail in the shadowy background is scarcely less vague and pale. But with all its vagueness it has sound study and careful observation as a basis, a respect for design, an endeavor to see character and then to express it.

Not all its rivals in the Exhibition have these qualities. Even so accomplished a painter as William Paxton has made but a piece of still life of William B. Gest, Esq., carrying out every detail with a sharpness that hurts. At the other extreme, Leopold Seyfert makes nothing at all of his sitter, Col. Richard H. Harte, C.M.G., but envelops and loses the quiet khaki-clad figure in the green splendor of official robes. De Forest Brush has been more successful than he is here in his Family Group,

ALFRED A. KNOPF BORZOI BOOKS 220 W. 42d ST., NEW YORK

The Romantic Woman By MARY BORDEN A month ahead of its scheduled date of publication *The Chicago Sunday Tribune* gave this book a full column on its first page—surely most unusual treatment for a novel. An amazing and sensational picture of Chicago society but also an American novel of very great distinction—one that will make its way among intelligent readers on its literary and artistic merit alone. $2.00 *net.*

Sophie PHILIP MOELLER'S newest comedy relates the exciting and extraordinary adventures of a single night in the life of Sophie Arnould, the most famous singer, the greatest wit and the most notorious lady of her day. The action is swift and the interest is cumulative and curious. The play is now running in New York with Miss Emily Stevens in the title rôle. Carl Van Vechten has written a charming and informative foreword. Yellow Toyogami boards with blue labels. $1.75 *net.*

Washington The Man Who Made Us A Ballad - Play by PERCY MACKAYE An unusual presentation of Washington, the Man—"neither statue nor statehouse painting, but a dynamic human being"—is this play now being acted by Mr. Walter Hampden. "In intent and spirit it is wholly admirable, sturdily American, broad-minded, fervid in maintaining the principles of liberty and brotherhood for mankind."—*The Nation.* Illustrated with scene designs by Robert Edmond Jones. $2.00 *net.*

The American Credo By GEORGE JEAN NATHAN and H. L MENCKEN A "contribution toward the interpretation of the national mind," in which the processes and results of American mob-thinking are sharply plumbed. "Probably the most extraordinary and important piece of work these gifted, brilliant and indefatigable critics have engaged upon. . . . A rapid, succinct and appalling delineation of the American mind in action."—*Chicago Tribune.* $1.75 *net.*

We Moderns By EDWIN MUIR Edited with an introduction by H. L. Mencken. An original and penetrating criticism of the modern spirit. A plea for a revival of the spirit of the Greeks—for the abandonment of the view of life as a moral lesson and its acceptance as a great adventure. The author is a young Scotsman and this, his first book, has attracted wide attention in England. $1.75 *net.*

The Three Mulla-Mulgars By WALTER DE LA MARE. Illustrated in color and black and white by Dorothy P. Lathrop This fairy tale for children of all ages is as full of atmosphere as the author's famous poems. "It ranks," says *The Chicago Evening Post,* "with the few children's classics in the English language." A beautiful example of bookmaking with 8 pages in full colors, four in black and white, head and tail pieces to each chapter and delightfully delicate end papers. $4.00 *net.*

NOTE: *Purchasers of Graham Wallas'* THE LIFE OF FRANCIS PLACE *whose copies do not contain the Portrait-Frontispiece of Place by Daniel Maclise, R.A., will be sent same, cut to size for insertion in the book, upon request to the Publisher.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a picture which has been shown before now. With all its defects, it has individuality. It is also the work of a distinguished artist who, if he is invited to exhibit, should be treated with consideration. But the big canvas hangs in a corridor, and, to emphasize its banishment, through an opening opposite is seen, in the center of one of the larger galleries, a pretentious, life-size, full-length portrait by a member of the Faculty of the Academy Schools. Wayman Adams, too, has been more successful than in his Dr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., but there is a seeking for character in the head, and vivacity, energy, in the handling throughout: the reason, no doubt, why this portrait also has been banished to a corridor. Albert Rosenthal's Hon. Alexander Simpson, Jr., is weak in drawing, with little solidity in the figure, but it has a sense of atmosphere, a feeling for color in the quiet arrangement of browns; a corner where it can easily be overlooked has been found for it. The other more notable portraits are Fred Wagner's Cartoonist, Maurice Fromkes's Composer, with lean, lined, thoughtful face, and Luis Mora's Ferruccio Vitale. Walter MacEwen's portrait of himself, too recently at the National Academy to call for fresh notice, is placed in another black corner where no one can see it.

Childe Hassam's large New York Winter Window looks less well here than it did in Fifty-seventh Street. So little life is in the figure, so little in the same artist's Sylvia Jewell, that his Japanese Iris, in which there is no figure at all, becomes a little masterpiece by comparison. Both Richard Miller and Frederick Frieseke have canvases, but their mannerisms grew upon them. The interest would be to see what they would do with new models and new draperies in a light that never yet shone into their studios.

The Temple Medal has fallen to Ernest Lawson. His Ice-Bound Falls is by far the finest landscape—the best thing in the show. The handling is direct and vigorous, and the water freezing as it falls, the eddying ice below, the pink buildings in their isolation telling so well in the white landscape, are all admirably studied and expressed. In snow and ice there is always, of course, the danger of Christmas card sentiment and prettiness, which Redfield's Day Before Christmas does not escape. It cannot stand comparison with Lawson's more vigorous work near which it hangs. Thaulow is a danger for other painters of snow. Had he never painted Norway in winter, surely Fred Wagner would never have seen the Banks of Derby Creek just as he has. In landscape, whatever the season, the clever facility of the American painter is almost always astounding. Of Nature, in all her moods and phases, he is the ready reporter—but that is his trouble. He seldom gives a personal impression. His emptiness sends one back in relief to the elaboration of the Hudson River School which he scorns. There are exceptions here, as there are exceptions everywhere. Alfred P. Miller has seen and felt the fine design in The Valley: San Diego and has chronicled the ingenious composition made by the rounded, curving, wooded hills in the distance and the tall lines of the nearer trees, working it out with a fine austerity of light and color. Paul King has never been less mannered than in his Lime Quarry, noting as he has the contrast between the deep encircling cliffs in the immediate foreground and the rich green country which stretches away from their very edge: a difficult problem in perspective, but not a trace of the difficulty left on the canvas. Charles Chapman has got the character of the great trees of the West in his Deserted Cabin. Gifford Beal suggests the relation of hills and sky and water in his Gate of the Highlands. And Leon Kroll has studied carefully and with sympathy the effect of smoke and snow by The River as it flows through the town. Henry McCarter's sentimentally titled Passing of the Horse is the most successful piece of decoration in the Academy, and there are other decorative works.

Nothing in the sculpture is so vivid and personal as Charles Grafly's Evangelist Felix, a well-modelled head, a keen profile, alertness in every feature. But the chief interest of the sculpture is in the use made of it this year by the sculpture jury. Plaques are hung with the paintings and smaller works are scattered through the galleries, adding pleasantly to their decorative effect. The Academy's Winter Exhibition has seldom been so well arranged from the sculptor's point of view and so badly selected by the painters.

N. N.

Redemption

Hindu and Christian

By Sidney Cave

Net $5.25

A notably successful attempt to correlate the Christian doctrine of Redemption with that of Hinduism. The reader cannot go far into the book without feeling the spell of its luminous style and literary charm, not to mention its conspicuous fairness and obvious desire to reach the truth.

Essays on Vocation

Edited by Basil Mathews

Net $1.75

Twelve practical essays designed to aid in the selecting of one's life work. Two preliminary essays deal with general principles: the remainder are devoted to the special fields of Art, Law, Commercial and Industrial occupations, Education, Nursing, the Ministry, etc.

At all booksellers or from the publishers

Oxford University Press
American Branch
35 West 32nd Street
New York

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

ALL the books reviewed in the foregoing pages can be ordered through the Readers' Service Department of The Nation. Ask us to quote prices, or to send books by express collect.

Address the

Readers' Service Department

The Nation

20 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

PUNISHING SCHLESWIG. By Christian Anderson..... 343

DOCUMENTS AND FOREIGN PRESS:

"Saturdaying" 344
The Syrian Nationalists 345
The Franco-British Agreement 346
The Negro Problem in South Africa..... 347
An Irish Appeal 348
The Suppressed Peace Offer from Soviet Russia..... 349

EVENTS OF THE WEEK..... 349

Punishing Schleswig

By CHRISTIAN ANDERSON

[By the terms of the peace treaty as it was handed to the Germans on May 7, 1919, the future national status of the northern part of Schleswig was to be determined by a plebiscite in each of three zones, the only option of the plebiscite being whether the territory was to be Prussian or Danish. Denmark refused to consider a vote in the third or southerly zone, and the treaty was amended to include merely the first two. The treaty provided for the evacuation of the two northern zones by the German authorities within ten days after it went into effect, or between January 10 and 20, 1920. During the same time the territory in question was to be placed under the authority of an International Commission of five members, and "within the same period the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils which have been constituted in this zone shall be dissolved" (Treaty of Versailles, Art. 109). On February 11, also in accordance with Art. 109 of the treaty, a plebiscite was held in Zone 1, which resulted in the cession of the territory to Denmark. The plebiscite in Zone 2 should be held about March 16. Meanwhile, on March 3 the New York *Times* printed a dispatch announcing the proclamation of an independent state of Schleswig-Holstein by representatives of the Schleswig and Holstein organizations and members of various political parties, assembled in Rendsburg. This action, it is reported, was taken during the absence of the three leading members of the International Commission.—EDITOR.]

OF all the people whose hopes the Peace Conference has doomed, the fate of Schleswig is surely the most tragic. Unfortunately, the world at large does not comprehend the situation and through ignorance many hail the plebiscite as an example of eminent fairness. But in the present case nothing could be further from the truth. Nobody can object to a plebiscite if the question at issue is one in which at least part of the people take a genuine interest. If, however, you first gouge out your victim's eyes and then offer him a "free choice" whether he next wants his ears or his nose cut off, the plebiscite is only an additional insult. Now, this is exactly what the Peace Conference has done to Schleswig. In consternation Schleswigers ask, what sin have they committed that they should be treated worse than Prussia itself? They were opposed to Prussia's war and only involuntarily fought in it. Certainly, Schleswig had nothing to gain by a Prussian victory, though it was not blind to the fact that, on the other hand, an Allied victory would mean death to its aspirations. America cannot be expected to realize that, while the Prussian cause was bad, the Allied cause was far from holy in all respects. In the war, Schleswig sympathized with the neutrals, not with either belligerent. Many small nations there were who prayed for deliverance from the Prussian yoke but who yet knew only too well that an unconditioned Allied victory might deliver them up to a worse fate.

Through ignorance, all American writers on the Schleswig question seem to take it for granted that the inhabitants of Schleswig are all or very nearly all Danes, and that they ardently desire to return to Denmark. So I must call attention to the fact that of a population of one and one-half millions, there are fewer than 150,000 Danes, that no part of Schleswig, not even the northern part, is wholly Danish, and that two-thirds at least is wholly German. In at least half of the territory of Schleswig not a single Dane can be found. In the city of Schleswig, in much of the territory north of it, and in all the territory south of it, there is not a single Dane, or a single person who by birth understands the Danish tongue. In all this territory there are far fewer persons who, through education, have become conversant with the Danish language than there are those who understand French or English.

It must be remembered that historically the Danes are the invaders of Schleswig, and it was due in part to Danish invasion that the "Angles" or "Engles" from the country directly north of the city of Schleswig emigrated to or invaded Great Britain in the sixth century and gave to Britannia the name of England. In the time of Christ the Danes were not even yet in possession of Jutland, but the entire peninsula was inhabited by purely Teuton stock. However, the Danish invasions in later times extended as far south as Oldenburg, but never resulted in more than small settlements. The people now living in Schleswig are as autochthonous as any people on the face of the earth, and they belong to the purely Germanic tribes.

The truth has been told about the Prussian persecution (and be it remembered that the Schleswigers themselves had no part in it, but it was done by Berlin officials) of the Danes in North Schleswig, but it was the persecution, quite as brutal, by the Danes of the German majority in Schleswig, that led the Duchies to revolt against Denmark and finally brought about the severance. And this Danish oppression will immediately recommence as soon as the Danish Government once more gets Schleswig in its power.

So it is a puzzle indeed. The Schleswigers as a whole do not wish to join Denmark. We have had frequent press dispatches to the effect that Denmark positively refuses to take anything more of Schleswig than the first zone. Nevertheless, the first two zones must vote on whether they wish to come under Danish rule. The Schleswigers hate the Danish Government as Ireland hates the British Government. Neither did the Schleswigers ever desire to be Prussians; they wanted to be what they were, Germans, and desired to be an integral self-governing unit in the German Federation, like the republics of Hamburg, Lübeck, and Bremen. But now Schleswig must vote under an Allied commission to decide which of two evils is the lesser.

Not until the terms of the peace treaty were published did it become known in the United States that Schleswig was under undisputed Soviet rule, and that under the terms of the treaty the workers' and soldiers' councils in the district were to be dissolved. It is unlikely, however, that such councils were Bolshevist. Industrialism has not yet invaded Schleswig except on its fringes and where Bolshevism has arisen it has been largely a protest against the evils of exploitation which is the heart and pulse of industrialism. Picture to yourself a city like Schleswig of some forty thousand inhabitants without a single rented house, without landlord or tenant. The poor of Schleswig

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are the fishermen, but each fisherman owns his own house and his own fishing-boat. The miller owns his mill and he employs at most a journeyman and an apprentice; the druggist owns his own drugstore and puts up his own prescriptions; the merchant owns his store-building as well as his goods and employs seldom more than two or three assistants. So it is throughout all the trades. The baker owns his own oven and he and his apprentices do their work together. There are no mammoth department stores; no huge chimneys blacken Schleswig's sky. The people of Schleswig are not divided into employers and employed, but neighbor works with neighbor. There is no propertyless or undomiciled family in all Schleswig; even the day-laborer owns his own cottage and his own garden and has a share in the undivided communal land still possessed by nearly every village. To the Schleswiger, when he first comes to this country, the American institution of the industrial "boss" looks like a prison system, and the American worker appears to him in the light of either prisoner or serf. Similarly, in Schleswig, the farmers own their own land, and it is tilled by the family. Almost all farms in Schleswig are of about the same size, from 60 to 80 acres. A farm of 160 acres is a double farm and is considered an anomaly, which occasionally happens through marriage or inheritance. For such a community socialism has little appeal. In fact, the social life Schleswig has enjoyed for generations would seem to be the thing Socialists everywhere dream of. The people have many community enterprises such as coöperative dairying, but they are also intensely individualistic. They insist upon possessing some portion of private property, but they consider this private property merely as a means to secure their maintenance. The idea that property can be made to yield income without labor has not yet entered their minds, for in all Schleswig, as recently as 1900, there was not a single man living solely on his income.

For many generations Schleswig has enjoyed true economic independence and for a very brief space of time (from the signing of the armistice to the Peace Conference), it also enjoyed genuine self-government and political liberty. But by the terms of the treaty of peace it can enjoy neither of these any longer.

"Saturdaying"

THE *Manchester Guardian* for February 5 prints the following account of the voluntary labor, which goes by the name of "Saturdaying," undertaken by Communists and non-Communists in Soviet Russia.

It seems that early this year [1919] the Central Committee of the Communist party (the Bolsheviki) put out a circular letter, calling upon the Communists "to work revolutionally," to emulate in the rear the heroism of their brothers at the front, pointing out that nothing but the most determined efforts and an increase in the productivity of labor could enable Russia to win through her difficulties of transport, etc. Kolchak, to quote from English newspapers, was "sweeping on to Moscow," and the situation was pretty threatening. As a direct result of this letter, on May 7, a meeting of Communists in the sub-district of the Moscow-Kazan Railway passed a resolution that, in view of the imminent danger to the Republic, Communists and their sympathizers should give up an hour a day of their leisure, and lumping these hours together do every Saturday six hours of manual labor; and, further, that these "Communist Saturdayings" should be continued "until complete victory over Kolchak should be assured." That decision of a local committee was the actual beginning of a movement which has since spread all over Russia, and since the complete victory over Kolchak has been assured is likely to continue as an institution so long as Soviet Russia is threatened by anyone else.

The decision was put into effect on May 10, when the first "Communist Saturdaying" in Russia took place on the Moscow-Kazan railway. The commissar of the railway, Communist clerks from the offices, and everyone else who wished to help marched to work, 182 in all, and put in 1,012 hours of manual labor, in which they finished the repairs of four locomotives and sixteen wagons, and loaded and unloaded 9,300 poods of engine and wagon parts and material. It was found that the productivity of labor in loading and unloading shown on this occasion was about 270 per cent. of the normal, and a similar superiority of effort was shown in the other kinds of work. This example was immediately copied on other railways. The Alexandrovsk railway had its first "Saturdaying" on May 17. Ninety-eight persons worked for five hours, and here also did two or three times as much as the usual amount of work done in the same number of working hours under ordinary circumstances. One of the workmen in giving an account of the performance wrote: "The comrades explain this by saying that in ordinary times the work was dull and they were sick of it, whereas on this occasion they were working willingly and with excitement. But now it will be shameful in ordinary hours to do less than in the Communist Saturdaying." . . .

The idea of the "Saturdayings" spread quickly from railways to factories, and by the middle of the summer reports of similar efforts were coming from all over Russia. Then Lenin became interested, seeing in these "Saturdayings" not only a special effort in the face of common danger, but an actual beginning of communism and a sign that socialism could bring about a greater productivity of labor than could be obtained under capitalism. He wrote: "This is a work of great difficulty and requiring much time, but it has begun, and that is the main thing. If in hungry Moscow in the summer of 1919 hungry workmen, who have lived through the difficult four years of the imperialistic war and then the year and a half of still more difficult civil war, have been able to begin this great work, what will not be its further development when we conquer in the civil war and win peace?" He sees in it a promise of work being done not for the sake of individual gain, but because of a recognition that such work is necessary for the general good, and in all he wrote and spoke about it he emphasized the fact that people worked better and harder when working thus than under any of the conditions (imitated from capitalist countries) imposed by the revolution in its desperate attempts to raise the productivity of labor. For this reason alone, he wrote, the first "Saturdaying" on the Moscow-Kazan railway was an event of historical significance, and not for Russia alone.

Whether Lenin is right or wrong in so thinking, "Saturdayings" have now become a regular institution, like Dorcas meetings in Victorian England, like the thousands of collective working parties instituted in England during the war with Germany. It remains to be seen how long they will continue, and if they will survive peace when that comes. At present the most interesting point about them is the large proportion of non-Communists who take an enthusiastic part in them. In many cases not more than 10 per cent. of Communists are concerned, though they take the initiative in organizing the parties and in finding the work to be done. The movement has spread like fire in dry grass, . . . and efforts are being made to control it, so that the fullest use may be made of it.

In Moscow it has been found worth while to set up a special bureau for "Saturdayings." Hospitals, railways, factories, or any other concerns working for the public good notify this bureau that they need the sort of work a "Saturdaying" provides. The bureau informs the local Communists where their services are required, and thus there is a minimum of wasted energy. The local Communists arrange the "Saturdaying," and anyone else joins in who wants. These "Saturdayings" are a hardship

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to none, because they are entirely voluntary, except for members of the Communist party, who are considered to have broken the party discipline if they refrain. But they can avoid the "Saturdayings" if they wish to by leaving the party. Indeed, Lenin points out that the "Saturdayings" are likely to assist in clearing out of the party those elements which join it with the hope of personal gain. He points out that the privileges of a Communist now consist in doing more work than other people in the rear, and on the front in having the certainty of being killed when other folk are merely taken prisoners. . . .

The Syrian Nationalists

THE following discussion of the nationalist movement in Syria and the Franco-British Agreement of 1916 is reprinted from the *Manchester Guardian* for January 26.

During the first year of the war an Arab Nationalist Committee, representing Mesopotamia as well as Syria, was formed secretly at Damascus. After drawing up their program in that city, the members communicated it by a confidential courier to Sherif (now King) Husein at Mecca, asking him if he agreed with it to negotiate with Great Britain and discover whether she would assist towards its realization in return for Arab military support. The Sherif consented, and a correspondence extending over many months ensued between his Lordship, acting for the Damascus Committee, and the British High Commissioner in Egypt, acting for his Majesty's Government. In the end the parties reached a measure of agreement which enabled military coöperation to be arranged and in the summer of 1916 the Sherif began the Arab revolt against Turkey in his home territory by an attack on the Turkish garrisons there.

These negotiations, of considerable import for the conduct of the war, are of far greater moment for the peace settlement which is soon to be made at Paris, and which may decide the destiny of the Ottoman Arabs for years, perhaps generations, to come. It is not easy to ascertain what was agreed upon, partly because "official circles" have never communicated the documents to the British public, whom they so closely concern, but also because the negotiations never resulted in a formal instrument signed by both parties, but consisted solely in an interchange of letters in which proposals were successively made, accepted or rejected, repeated, modified, or waived, so that each party will produce its own version of the pledge which it has given or received.

Considerable light was cast on them, however, by the Soviet Publicity Bureau after its raid on the Czar's archives, and if we combine this information (relating primarily to the Franco-British Agreement of 1916, with which we shall deal in a moment) with such hints regarding the agreement with the Arabs as have transpired in England we can more or less establish several important points. In the first place, Husein acted throughout as a spokesman and not as a principal, and made it clear at every stage of the negotiations that his demands were those of a body representing the most numerous and progressive Arab populations in the Ottoman Empire, and not claims for his own aggrandizement. In the second place, the Damascus Committee never proposed that the Arab provinces of Turkey should be brought under the single sovereignty of Sherif Husein or of any other Arab sovereign. Knowing how unripe the political conditions among their countrymen were for such a scheme, they demanded no more than the liberation of all Arabs from Turkey, insisting merely that the liberated populations should be allowed to govern themselves and should not exchange Turkish for some other foreign domination.

The definition of this area was evidently the crucial issue, and this is not surprising when we remember that the claims presented by King Husein were formulated by inhabitants of Syria and Mesopotamia. The Turks' precarious hold over the Arabian peninsula could easily by shaken off, and the Bedouin principalities had little to attract the cupidity of other empires. King Husein's dominions in particular were secured against any European aggression by the fact that they contained the holy cities of Islam, on which no Christian Power would venture to lay hands. But Syria and Mesopotamia, settled countries on the northern border of the Arab area, where the military hold of the Turk was far stronger and where there were all manner of European interests and concessions, could not feel so certain of winning their independence, and it was therefore of capital importance to them to persuade Great Britain to recognize it within precise frontiers.

The bargaining seems to have gone as follows. The Arabs first proposed a line starting from Mersina on the Cilician coast and running eastward to the Persian frontier. Arab independence was to be recognized in the Asiatic territories to the south of that, including the entire Arabian peninsula except for the British protectorate of Aden. The British Government gave the recognition asked for in respect of this area, with the exception of the Cilician littoral and such part of the littoral of Syria as lies west of the four districts of Aleppo, Hama, Homs, and Damascus. The Arabs accepted the exclusion of Cilicia (where the Arab element is small), but reaffirmed their claim to the Syrian coast (where the Arabic language is universally spoken, and where a consciousness of common nationality with other Syrians irrespective of locality or religion has been growing rapidly of recent years). King Husein is even reported to have stated to the High Commissioner that though the exclusion of western Syria would not deter the Arabs from coöperating with the Allies in the war, they would fight for its liberty against all comers when once the Turk had been turned out.

The negotiations also touched on other questions. In Irak, for instance (though not in northern Mesopotamia), the Sherif appears to have consented to the retention of administrative control by Great Britain, without any stipulations as to its extent or duration. And the fact that no reservation was made about Palestine pledged us, by implication, to recognize an independent Arab Government there, since Palestine was included within the limits which the Arabs had laid down. But the Syrian coast was the crux, and our opposition to Arab self-determination here was based of course on consideration for France.

The Foreign Office has a good reputation for honest diplomacy under the old rules of the game, and Sir Edward Grey was then Foreign Secretary. We may guess, therefore, that the Arab proposals were immediately communicated to France, which was known to have interests in Syria, and the negotiations that resulted in the Anglo-French Agreement of 1916 must have been going on simultaneously with the negotiations between the British Government and King Husein, the fruits of which were the Arab revolt in the summer of the same year. The substance of the Anglo-French Agreement is now known. . . . Comparison of this agreement with what has been said above about our agreement with the Arabs shows that the two fit into one another.

In that part of Syria where we had refused to recognize any Arab claims (as well as in Cilicia and considerable parts of Anatolia and Armenia) we did consent that France should set up any form of government she chose, while in Irak, where the Sherif had agreed to our administrative control, we obtained the reciprocal consent of France to our doing what we liked. As for the Arab countries lying between Irak and western Syria—that is, the four districts of eastern Syria and northern Mesopotamia—the two Powers seem, indeed, to have pledged themselves jointly to uphold Arab independence there (as Great Britain had pledged herself already in negotiating with the Arabs), but they also drew a line across this region and agreed that, if the independent Arabs on either side of the line should need political or economic assistance from foreigners, the privilege of giving it should be monopolized by France on the one side and Great Britain on the other. There were other clauses about water-rights, strategic railways, and free trade, and there was to be an international Palestine (minus Cilicia, Haifa, Hebron, and Trans-Jordania). . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French Government probably expected that the Turk would be driven out of Syria (if at all) by French forces, as British forces had driven him out of Irak already, and that the "Arab Governments" in their sphere of the "independent area" would be set up by French political officers. Such Arab Governments would infallibly apply for French assistance, and then France would have a protectorate in the interior as well as direct administration on the coast, for are not protectorates technically treaties between an outside Power and an independent native state? Such calculations might well have been suggested by the first phase of the Arab rising. The Damascus Committee was discovered and crushed by the Turks, the movement in Syria and Mesopotamia was paralyzed; only the Hejaz rose when the moment came, and the Hejazis had neither the military strength nor the political title to drive the Turk from Syria and rule it in his stead.

But as the war went on the situation altered. Prince Feisal, commanding the Hejaz Northern Army, with headquarters at Akaba, had to depend at first on his father's (Husein's) tribal levies, but gradually he built up a regular force of Syrians and Mesopotamians—exiles, refugees, or prisoners of war from the Ottoman army—and this was the force with which he played his brilliant part in Allenby's final offensive. The utter collapse of the Turks did the rest, and before French troops could arrive on the spot Beirut had run up the Arab flag and set up a national administration, while the Syrian army of liberation was entering Tripoli and Latakia.

The French were disappointed, but the Arabs' turn for disappointment was soon to come. Both French and Arabs in Syria were under General Allenby's command and, acting of course under instructions from home, he ordered the Arabs (that is, the Syrians) to hand over to the French the provisional administration in the greater part, though not quite the whole, of the coastal zone of Syria as defined in the negotiations discussed above. Thus we saved our own face and left both our Allies aggrieved; and our recent withdrawal from Syria, while it extricates us from an embarrassing position and vindicates our diplomatic good faith, is not so certainly to the interest of France, who pressed for it, and is quite certainly against the interests of Syria. The French and Syrian military administrations now stand face to face without the restraining influence of a superior authority; the French seem to be advancing into the districts of their "zone of direct administration" (in the terms of the agreement) which were not handed over to them by Allenby; there are reports of resistance by Syrian national volunteers; and it is to be feared that, even if Feisal has reached an agreement with the French, his Government may be swept away by a revolution and Syria plunged into a desperate attempt to drive the French out by force.

What is the Syrians' case? First, they have a strong desire to govern themselves; the different sections of the population have proved it by taking part in the war against the Turks; they consider that the Allies are bound by their principles to respect this desire; and they point out that national self-government is being vouchsafed to peoples less fitted for it than themselves. The Turks, for instance (who, incidentally, were on the wrong side in the war), will certainly be allowed to have it, yet the Turks still massacre non-Turkish minorities. Nothing like the Turkish treatment of Greeks and Armenians can be brought up against Syria, and in fact there are no alien minorities there in the same sense as in the country beyond the Taurus, for everyone in Syria speaks Arabic and the sense of nationality has been growing fast between sect and sect.

The Syrians, then, deny the necessity of placing their country under a mandate, and in the second place they represent that France has special disqualifications for that commission. The two countries may have conflicting economic interests, for there used to be a large export of raw silk from Syria to the factories of Lyons, and the French could hardly look with favor on the Syrians' ambition to make use of the water-power of the Orontes and work up their silk at home. But economic considerations are secondary. The besetting fear of the Syrians is that French policy would break up their new and cherished national movement, not perhaps deliberately in order to "divide and rule," but because French policy in Syria is sentimental and traditional. It dates back to the Crusades, when religion and not nationality divided and united people politically, and it rests upon a local championship of the Roman Church.

In a French mandate the Syrians foresee a Catholic hegemony —not an ascendancy of foreign Catholics over all Syrians, which would not matter so much, but an incitement to the Syrian Catholics to leave the national camp and throw in their lot with France, which would mean the end of Syrian national unity. Recent reports indicate that the Syrian Catholics themselves are more and more taking the nationalist point of view on this question.

And what is the French case? First, a very human desire to bring home spoils as fine as ours. But the driving force behind the French claims is historical sentiment.

"Remember," said M. Clemenceau last year to an advocate of the Arab cause, "that French interests in Syria go back to the Crusades." "And you, sir, must remember," said the other gentleman (who told the story to the writer of this article), "that the Syrians won the Crusades and are proud of it." But those are terrible memories to call up. Moslems regard the Latin invasion of the Levant as we regard the Turkish conquest of Constantinople, and it is a rather sinister coincidence that the line drawn in the Anglo-French Agreement between the French littoral and the international Palestine on the one hand and the "independent" interior of Syria on the other coincides almost exactly with the boundary between the Catholic and Moslem principalities during the Crusading period. Across this line Frenchmen and Syrians are facing each other again today with arms in their hands.

The Franco-British Agreement

THE following text of the Franco-British Agreement of 1916 was taken by the *Manchester Guardian* from *Le Temps* (Paris). The map referred to was not made public. The agreement was contained in a letter dated May 9, 1916, from M. Paul Cambon, the French Ambassador, to Sir Edward Grey.

1. France and Great Britain are disposed to recognize and to protect an independent Arab State or a Confederation of Arab States in the Zones A and B indicated on the annexed map, under the suzerainty of an Arab chief. In the Zone A France and in the Zone B Great Britain will have a right of priority in regard to all enterprises and local loans. In the Zone A France and in the Zone B Great Britain will alone provide advisers or foreign officials when requested by the Arab State or by the Confederation of Arab States.

2. In the Blue Zone France and in the Red Zone Great Britain will be authorized to establish such administration, direct or indirect, as they desire and as they shall judge convenient to establish after agreement with the State or Confederation of Arab States.

3. In the Brown Zone there shall be established an international administration whose form shall be decided after consultation with Russia, and then in agreement with the other Allies and the representative of the Sherif of Mecca.

4. There shall be accorded to Great Britain first the ports of Haifa and Acre, secondly the guarantee of a definite quantity of water from the Tigris and the Euphrates in the Zone A for the Zone B. His Majesty's Government, on its part, pledges itself never to enter into negotiations with a view to the cession of Cyprus to a third Power without the previous consent of the French Government.

5. Alexandria is to be a free port for the commerce of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Empire, and there shall be no difference of treatment in port dues nor any special advantage refused to British mercantile ships or British merchandise; there shall be free transit via Alexandretta and the railways traversing the Blue Zone, whether this merchandise be destined for or originate from the Red Zone, Zone B, or Zone A; and no difference of treatment shall be made, directly or indirectly, against English merchandise on any railway, nor against English merchandise or ships in any port serving the above-mentioned zones.

Haifa shall be a free port for the commerce of France, her colonies, and her protectorates, and there shall be no difference of treatment or advantage in the matter of port dues which can be refused to French ships or French merchandise. There shall be free transit for French merchandise via Haifa and the English railway across the Brown Zone, whether these goods originate from or are destined for the Blue Zone, or the Zone A or the Zone B, and there shall be no difference of treatment, direct or indirect, at the expense of French merchandise upon any railway line, or at the expense of French merchandise or French ships in any port serving the above-mentioned zones.

6. In the Zone A the Bagdad Railway shall not be prolonged southwards beyond Mosul and in the Zone B northwards beyond Samara until a railway uniting Bagdad and Aleppo by the valley of the Euphrates has been completed, and that only with the help of the two Governments.

7. Great Britain will have the right to construct, administer, and be the sole proprietor of a railway uniting Haifa with the Zone B. She will have, further, a perpetual right to transport troops at all times along this railway. It must be understood by both Governments that this railway must facilitate the junction of Bagdad and Haifa, and it is further understood that if technical difficulties or the cost of maintenance of this line of junction in the Brown Zone render the execution of it impracticable the French Government will be disposed to consider that the line may traverse the polygon Barries-Keis-Maril-Silbrad-Tem-Hotsda-Mesuire before reaching the Zone B.

8. For a period of twenty years the Turkish Customs tariffs shall remain in force throughout the Blue and Red zones as well as in the Zones A and B, and no increase in the rates or alteration in *ad valorem* or specific duties shall be made save with the consent of both Powers. There shall be no internal Customs between any of the zones mentioned above. Customs dues leviable upon goods destined for the interior shall be exacted at the ports of entry and transmitted to the administration of the zone for which the goods are intended.

9. It is understood that the French Government will never enter upon any negotiations for the cession of its rights, and will never cede the rights it possesses in the Blue zone to any third Power except the Arab State or the Confederation of Arab States, without the previous consent of His Majesty's Government, which on its part gives a similar assurance to the French Government in regard to the Red zone.

10. The English and French Governments, as protectors of the Arab State, will agree not to acquire, and will not agree to the acquisition by a third Power, of territorial possessions in the Arabian peninsula, or construct a naval base in the islands off the east coast of the Red Sea. This, however, shall not prevent such a rectification of the frontier of Aden as may be judged necessary because of the recent aggression of the Turks.

11. The negotiations with the Arabs for the frontiers of the State, or the Confederation of Arab States, shall proceed in the same way as before in the name of both Powers.

12. It is further understood that measures to control the importation of arms into the Arab territory shall be considered by both Governments.

To this letter, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, Sir Edward Grey replied on May 15, asking for a special guarantee, which was given to him the same day in the following letter from the French Ambassador, M. Cambon:

By his communication of this date your Excellency has expressed the desire, before answering my letter of the 9th of this month relative to the creation of an Arab State, to receive the assurance that in those regions which shall become French, or in which French interests shall become predominant, British concessions and rights of navigation, together with the rights and privileges of all British religious education and medical establishments shall be maintained. It should be understood, on the other hand, that the same rights should be recognized to France by the King's Government in the sphere allotted to England.

I have the honor to inform your Excellency that the French Government is ready to sanction the various British concessions of date anterior to the war in the regions which shall be allotted to it, or which shall come under its control. As to the religious, educational, and medical establishments, they would continue to function as in the past, it being always understood that such a reservation does not involve the maintenance of the rights of jurisdiction and of the capitulations in these territories.

To this letter Sir Edward Grey replied on May 16, 1916, accepting in the name of the British Government the text of the agreement embodied in M. Paul Cambon's first letter.

The Negro Problem in South Africa

A DEPUTATION of native South Africans, at present in London, has petitioned the British Government to intervene with the Union Government in behalf of the native population. The following account of their mission and of the situation in South Africa is taken from the *Workers' Dreadnought* (London) of January 10.

The South African deputation has interviewed Colonel Amery, the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, but he has replied that the Imperial Government cannot interfere in the internal affairs of the self-governing dominions. The deputation replied that the British Government had put the color bar into the South African Constitution, and that the British Government must take it out. But the British Government refuses to budge.

General Smuts, who is so full of enthusiasm for oppressed peoples outside the British Empire, and who is supposed to be a zealot for the League of Nations, is hostile to the natives. Botha was at least willing to confer with the natives, and to hear their case; Smuts will not receive them.

At the request of the South African deputation, members of the British Labor party raised the color bar question in Parliament, but they were simply told that the Imperial Government could not interfere, and nothing further has happened.

At home in South Africa the natives meet with more opposition than assistance from the white workers. Only the International Socialist League, which is itself small and struggling, stretches out a hand to them.

The Trade Unions have also a color bar, and refuse to admit the natives; they also successfully insist that employers shall discriminate against the natives, and refuse them any skilled work.

The International Socialist League has started in Johannesburg an organization called the Industrial Workers of Africa, which is the first industrial organization of colored workers, and is still very small. The International Socialist League demands equal pay for equal work, irrespective of race or color, but the white workers are, on the whole, afraid of this. The white workers are really the foremen and overseers in South African industry; the natives are doing the greater part of the work. In the mines, the proportion of white and black workers is roughly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one white to every hundred blacks; in engineering factories the proportion is about one white to five blacks.

The white workers themselves employ black labor to assist them in their gardens, and so on.

Thus, privately, and as the foremen for their capitalist employers, the white workers are the black man's little masters.

It is the capitalist who today asks for the removal of the color bar in the workshops. He sees native workers, even when not knowing how to read and write, able to do highly skilled industrial work. He wants that work cheaply done, and, therefore, he would like to employ the native.

The menace to the white workers increases, and the natives cannot use industrial action to improve their conditions, because it is illegal for them to strike, and if they defy the law the Government will fire on them.

In large sections of the country the African peoples came under British rule, not by conquest, but willingly, because they were told that they would have absolute justice within the Empire. They did not understand the methods of capitalist diplomacy. In the Boer war the natives of Cape Colony helped the British, and though in the Transvaal and Orange Free State the natives were neutral and cared for the farms of the Boers whilst they were fighting, they finally took sides with the British and welcomed their victory.

Under the Boers the laws against the natives were harsh, but the Boers frequently failed to enforce them, and the natives preserved an independence they cannot maintain in face of the present highly organized British military system.

Many natives still blame the Boers for the bad laws passed against them in South Africa; they think that if they can only get behind the South African Government (which the Boers control because they live in South Africa) the people in the British mother country will give them justice.

This is one reason why, when the European war broke out, the South Africans offered their services to the British. At first they were told this was a white man's war, and that they could only help by working; but later, when it was found that the war was to be longer and more difficult than had been expected, the Africans were asked to help. Forty thousand went with Botha to German Southwest Africa, ten thousand with Smuts to German East Africa, and twenty-five thousand to France. But now the war is over new repressive laws are being passed against them.

Some of the natives feel a deep resentment. "Here is the British Government," they say, "that is always interfering in other countries, and cannot interfere to do justice in its own Dominions."

The natives get no sympathy from the so-called Nationalists or the Boers, who have always resented British rule. The natives remember that under the Boers the black man had no legal remedy if his white master ill-treated him, and that now a native can bring his case to court, and, if the judge be broad-minded, the native may get some redress. But the natives see that new laws are being built up to their disadvantage. They think this is because the British wish to conciliate the Boers and to keep them from fighting for independence. . . . But some of the natives are beginning to wonder whether, after all, there is a very great difference between the Boers and the British. They reflect that if the Boers were to get their independence the black man would find it easier to deal with them than with the mighty militarism of Britain.

Even fifteen years ago, they say, the position of the natives was more hopeful than now. Any organized movement amongst them then, however small, would gain results. Now, their white conquerors have nothing to fear from them; the aeroplane and the machine gun have rendered the white man supreme.

The South African deputation has been well received by many sections of the Labor movement. It will travel round the country addressing enthusiastic meetings, and finally it will return to South Africa to work, if it is wise, to build up, with the International Socialists, a solid organization of black and white workers, working together, without distinction of color, race or creed, to wrest the power from the capitalists and to establish the African Soviets.

An Irish Appeal

THE following appeal for the relief of political prisoners in Ireland was recently addressed by representatives of the "principal women's associations of Ireland" to the women of other nations.

In 1918 there were 1,109 arrests in Ireland for political offenses. This year (1919) by the end of August the count had already reached 714. At the present moment there are some 700 political prisoners, both men and women, in jail in Ireland, or transported to English or Scotch jails. It will be seen that the proportion of political prisoners to population in Ireland is enormous when one considers that the actual population is little over four millions; thirty millions being scattered through the world as a result of England's misrule. Therefore, the proportion according to population in Ireland today is greater than that in Russia under the régime of the Czar.

Out of 105 Irish representatives returned to Parliament, seventy-three are Republicans of whom all except four have been or are now in prison; our one woman member of Parliament, Countess de Markievicz, Minister of Labor, has been in prison since 1916 for two years and two months. She was elected while she was in Holloway prison, and has only enjoyed two months' liberty since her election. Under English military rule, children as young as eleven years have been kidnapped and shut up and their distracted parents refused even the knowledge of their whereabouts. Men have been sentenced to two years' imprisonment for singing a patriotic song; others have been imprisoned for giving their names in Irish; others for having Republican election literature in their possession, or for drilling; and one little boy for "whistling derisively" at the police. Many have been kept for months in prison without any charge at all.

Almost alone among civilized nations England herds her political prisoners with criminals; in each case where the Irish political prisoners protested against this they were brutally ill-treated.

Some have died in prison, many have been released only to die, others have had their health permanently impaired, and some have but exchanged the prison cell for a lunatic asylum.

The infamous Cat and Mouse Act, inaugurated in England against the suffrage prisoners, and which consists of releasing a prisoner when the prison doctor thinks he is likely to die and rearresting him if his health improves, is in practice in Ireland.

On the 12th of October, 1919, the Lord Mayor of Dublin visited Mountjoy Prison and stated that he found forty-four political prisoners handcuffed; many of them seemed very weak. They had been in handcuffs for ten days continuously—some with their hands fixed behind their backs.

In the name of the principal women's associations of Ireland, we address this appeal to our sisters in other countries, asking them to use their influence to demand the formation of an international committee of inquiry, composed of men and women, who in the interests of humanity would send delegates to inspect the prisons used for the detention of Irish political prisoners. Similar committees composed of neutrals sent delegates to visit the prison camps in the belligerent countries during the war to insure that the usages of humanity were maintained. Should England now refuse to allow what France, Germany, Austria, and Italy willingly accepted, she stands self-condemned.

The Vatican, America, Holland, Switzerland, and Spain were foremost in the work of ameliorating the condition of the prisoners of war; could not some of the members of these neutral committees be persuaded to extend their services and protection to the Irish Republican prisoners of war?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seeing that all liberty of the press, all liberty of free speech, have been abolished under English military rule in Ireland, all our Republican and many other newspapers suppressed, and public meetings prohibited, we appeal to the civilized world to break down the wall of silence with which England seeks to surround Ireland, and to let the light into those prisons where England is trying to destroy the best and bravest of our race.

CONSTANCE DE MARKIEVICZ, *Union of Women*
HANNA SHEEHY SKEFFINGTON, *Irishwomen's Franchise League*
HELENA MOLONY, *Irish Women Workers' Union*
LOUIE BENNETT, *Irishwomen's International League*
MAUD GONNE MACBRIDE, *Daughters of Erin*
KATHLEEN LYNN, *League of Delegates*

The Suppressed Peace Offer from the Soviet Government of Russia

THE peace offer to the United States from the Soviet Government of Russia, which the Department of State refused to publish and characterized as "an effort to further Soviet propaganda," was printed as a dispatch from its Berlin correspondent in the New York *American* of March 6.

Moscow, February 24

State Department, Washington, D. C.

The victorious advance of the valiant Soviet army in Siberia and the universal, popular movement against the counter-revolution and against foreign invasion which has spread with irresistible force throughout eastern Siberia, have brought into immediate proximity the question of reëstablishing connection between Soviet Russia and the United States of America.

Reports that have reached us from our representative, Mr. Martens, show with full clearness that American commerce and industry are able to help in a very large measure in the great work of the reconstruction of Russia's economies, that the United States can play a gigantic rôle in the realization of this problem, and that numerous prominent representatives of the American business world are quite willing to take an active part in this work.

The more the trials of civil war that Russia has gone through are retreating into the past, the more will all the forces of the Russian people concentrate upon the fundamental aim of reconstructing the country, and American production, wealth, and enterprise can be among the greatest assets in helping us to attain our purpose.

It can be affirmed decidedly that the connection between Soviet Russia and America will be of the greatest use to both parties and that both will reap from it the largest benefits.

Having no intention whatever of interfering with the internal affairs of America, and having for its sole aim peace and trade, the Russian Soviet Government is desirous of beginning without delay peace negotiations with the American Government.

On December 5 and 7, the All-Russian Congress of Soviets solemnly proposed to all Governments of the Allied and Associated Powers, and to each of them separately, to commence negotiations with the view of concluding peace.

Once more this proposal is made, and we ask the Government of the United States of America to inform us of its wishes with respect of a place and time for peace negotiations between the two countries.

CHICHERIN,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

Events of the Week

MARCH 3. The Belgian Chamber granted suffrage in communal elections to women twenty-one years of age, with an amendment excluding women of "notorious misconduct." All Catholic members voted for the measure, all but two Liberals against it, while the Socialists were divided.

MARCH 5. An association has been formed by a number of French manufacturers to aid the national movement toward repopulation. A system of bonuses for children, graduated according to the number in each family, and of monthly allowances for their maintenance has been arranged, all payments to be made to the mothers.

MARCH 6. The Portuguese Government's announcement that any public service employees concerned in the recent postal, telegraph, and railway strike who did not return to work within forty-eight hours would be summarily dismissed, created a storm of protest from the Labor members of the Chamber, and at the end of the debate the Government was defeated. Antonio Silva, former Minister of Public Works, has formed a new Cabinet.

MARCH 7. It was reported from Johannesburg that on February 25 several hundred striking native miners attacked white miners as they were about to descend into a mine shaft. Troops were called in to quell the riot, which resulted in the death of four negroes, and the wounding of thirty-five negroes and six whites.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
Monographs and separates in Sciences, Economics, History, Philology, Philosophy, etc.
List of titles and prices free on request.
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

CAN MANKIND SURVIVE?
By MORRISON I. SWIFT
Is Evolution, as man has accepted it, sowing the seeds of early and inevitable human extinction? If so, can man change the course of evolution, and save the race? These are the problems of "Can Mankind Survive?" $1.50; postpaid $1.60.
PUBLISHED BY **MARSHALL JONES CO.** BOSTON

MARRIAGE As It Was, Is, and SHOULD BE. By Annie Besant. An intensely interesting treatment of the subject by a famous woman. 25c. a copy.
THE CRUCIBLE (Agnostic, Freethought), 4 samples, all different—10c.
RAYMER'S OLD BOOK STORE
1330 First Avenue Seattle, Wash.

LARNED'S HISTORY OF THE WORLD
OR
Seventy Centuries of the Life of Mankind
5 volumes. Illustrated in color and black and white. 1470 pages. Bound in cloth and boards. Published at $12.00. Our special price $3.00.
At both stores or by mail, $3.25
McDEVITT-WILSON'S, Inc.
30 Church St. (Hudson Terminal) 55 Vesey St. New York City

Essays in Social Justice
By T. N. CARVER, David A. Wells Professor of Economics, Harvard University
429 pages. $2.25
Stimulating and vigorous essays on What is Justice?, The Ultimate Basis of Social Conflict, Economic Competition, How Much is a Man Worth?, Interest, Socialism and the Present Unrest, The Single Tax, The Cure for Poverty, Social Service, and related topics.
At all bookshops.
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
29 Randall Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
280 Madison Ave., New York City

Getting Ahead
is the story of Peter Perkins and how he accumulated $10,000 in ten years by investing $25 per month in high-grade listed stocks and bonds on a novel plan. "Getting Ahead" is as interesting as anything you ever read.
Thousands have read it and are now "getting ahead" financially on the same plan. You will be fascinated with it. But better still, it will show you a new way to invest your savings monthly—how to get interest, plus a PROFIT, on your money—without sacrificing safety. We send it free. WRITE FOR IT TODAY.
KRIEBEL & CO.
INVESTMENT BANKERS
145S South La Salle St., Chicago

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literary Agencies and Exchanges

For Authors, Playwrights Dramatists, Teachers, etc.

THE FISK TEACHERS' AGENCIES
EVERETT O. FISK & Co., *Proprietors.*

Boston, 2A Park Street. Chicago, 814 Steger Bldg.
New York, 225 Fifth Ave. Denver, 317 Masonic Bldg.
Syracuse, 402 Dillaye Bld. Portland, 509 Journal Bldg.
Pittsburg, 549 Un. Arcade. Berkeley, 2161 Shattuck Av.
Birmingham, 809 Title Bld. Los Angeles, 510 Spring St.

Send to any address above for registration form.

HARLAN P. FRENCH, Pres. W. W. ANDREWS, Sec.
ALBANY TEACHERS' AGENCY, Inc.
Supplies Schools and Colleges with Competent Teachers, Assists Teachers in obtaining positions. Send for Bulletin. 81 Chapel Street, Albany, N. Y.

Garrick Theatre, 35th St., near B'way, N. Y. Evs 8.30 Mats. Thurs. & Sat., 2.30
The Theatre Guild's
4th Production This Season
Now Playing
"JANE CLEGG"
By ST. JOHN ERVINE
Author of "JOHN FERGUSON" which will be revived later
WATCH

Position Wanted

YOUNG MAN, A.B., A.M., age twenty-nine, desires situation, in Boston or suburbs, as stenographer or secretary to professional man, educator, or literary man, or in school, library, publishing house, or other institution, where stress is *not* laid on business requirements. Translation work and literary research offered. Excellent references furnished. Address: K. G. Darling, 9 Ellery Street, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

Have You
Indexes for Volumes 105, 106 and 107
The Nation for
All September - 1918 January 4, 1919
November 2, 16, 1918 January 11, 1919
?
Address the Readers' Service Department
20 Vesey Street, The Nation New York, N. Y.

Advocate of Peace
Monthly Official Organ
American Peace Society (1815)
ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, *Editor*
GEORGE PERRY MORRIS, *Asst. Editor*
Mail your subscription today
$1.50
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY
612, 613, 614 Colorado Building
Washington, D. C.

Training for Authorship

How to write, what to write, and where to sell.

Cultivate your mind. Develop your literary gifts. Master the art of self-expression. Make your spare time profitable. Turn your ideas into dollars.

Courses in Short-Story Writing, Versification, Journalism, Play Writing, Photoplay Writing, etc., taught personally by Dr. J. Berg Esenwein, for many years editor of Lippincott's Magazine, and a staff of literary experts. Constructive criticism. Frank, honest, helpful advice. *Real teaching.*

Dr. Esenwein

One pupil has received over $5,000 for stories and articles written mostly in spare time—"play work," he calls it. Another pupil received over $1,000 before completing her first course. Another, a busy wife and mother, is averaging over $75 a week from photoplay writing alone.

There is no other institution or agency doing so much for writers, young or old. The universities recognize this, for over one hundred members of the English faculties of higher institutions are studying in our Literary Department. The editors recognize it, for they are constantly recommending our courses.

We publish *The Writer's Library*, 13 volumes; descriptive booklet free. We also publish *The Writer's Monthly*, the leading magazine for literary workers; sample copy 20 cents, annual subscription $2.00. Besides our teaching service, we offer a manuscript criticism service.

150-Page illustrated catalogue free. *Please Address*
The Home Correspondence School
Dep't. 79 Springfield, Mass.
ESTABLISHED 1897 INCORPORATED 1904

Just Published

The Truth About the Lusk Committee

A Report of the Legislative Committee of the People's Freedom Union

In Pamphlet Form
25c

Order copies through the Readers' Service Department

The Nation
20 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him, and The Nation.

85,000 VOLUMES IN OUR ANNUAL SALE OF BOOKS
Publishers' Remainders and Overstocks
At An Average Half of Publishers' Prices
Every Book Perfect
HOCHSCHILD, KOHN & CO.
Baltimore, Md.
Send for Catalogue No. 6.

Spanish Books

WHOLESALE ALL SUBJECTS RETAIL
Spanish Dailies and Periodicals
COMPAÑIA HISPANO-AMERICANA
156 West 14th Street, corner 7th Avenue, N. Y.

Foreign and American Dealers in

Rare Books. Autographs. Manuscripts. Prints. Engravings. etc

BOOKS—All out-of-print books supplied, no matter on what subject. Write us. We can get you any book ever published. Please state wants. When in England call and see our 50,000 rare books. BAKER'S GREAT BOOKSHOP. 14-16 John Bright Street, Birmingham, England.

Autographs BOOKS Manuscripts
Catalogues post free from HERBERT E. GORFIN, 1, Walerand Road, Lewisham London, S. E. 13

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES TO BE HAD at ABRAHAM'S BOOK STORE, 145 4th Avenue

QUARTERLY REVIEW
$4.50 *per year* *English Edition* $1.50 *per copy*
LEONARD SCOTT PUB. CO., 249 W. 13th St., New York

FOR THE BOOK LOVER
Rare books—First editions.
Latest Catalogue Sent on Request
C. GERHARDT, 25 W. 42d Street, New York

ELLIS, 29, New Bond Street London, W. 1., England
The Oldest Bookshop in London. Est. 1728
Commissions executed at London auction sales.
Catalogues of Rare and Interesting Books, Post Free.

BOOKS, AUTOGRAPHS, PRINTS Catalogues Free
R. ATKINSON, 188, Peckham Rye, London, S.E. 22, England

BOOKS on IRELAND and THE IRISH
OLD AND NEW BOUGHT AND SOLD
C. A. O'CONNOR, 21 Spruce St., New York
CORRESPONDENCE SOLICITED

ISIS

International Quarterly Devoted to the History of Science and Civilization, Edited by
GEORGE SARTON, D.Sc.
Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

No. 7 (Vol. III, 1) just issued:
Seventh critical bibliography of publications relating to the History, Philosophy and Organization of Science and to the History of Civilization.
Sarton.—The Faith of a Humanist.
Fl. Cajori.—The purpose of Zeno's arguments on motion.
A. Georges-Berthier.—Le mécanisme cartésien et la physiologie au XVIIe siècle.
Shorter notes and reviews.
Vol. I., 50 Belgian francs: Vols. II. and III., each 30 francs. Ed. de luxe from Vol. II. on, each Vol. 50 francs.

The subscription to Vol. III. (about 500 pages) is open: 30 francs. The remaining copies of Vols. I. and II. cost respectively 50 and 30 francs.
Those who believe in the New Humanism should subscribe to "Isis."

Publisher:
WEISSENBRUCH, IMPRIMEUR DU ROI,
49 rue du Poinçon, Brussels, Belgium

Strunsky Restaurants

Eat where the food is good, the environment pleasant and the prices right :: :: ::

THREE STEPS DOWN
19 West 8th Street
UPTOWN BRANCH
34 West 35th Street

201 Second Avenue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED